

The Best of Red, Right, and Blue

Rick Bulow

Copyright © 2015 Rick Bulow

Published by FastPencil
307 Orchard City Drive
Suite 210
Campbell CA 95008 USA
info@fastpencil.com
(408) 540-7571
(408) 540-7572 (Fax)
<http://www.fastpencil.com>

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior consent of the publisher.

The Publisher makes no representations or warranties with respect to the accuracy or completeness of the contents of this book and specifically disclaim any implied warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose. Neither the publisher nor author shall be liable for any loss of profit or any commercial damages.

Printed in the United States of America.

First Edition

Contents

Introduction	vii
History of Red, Right, and Blue	viii
CHAPTER 1: PART ONE: ANDREW BREITBART	1
Apologize for WHAT?	2
Alinsky v. Breitbart	3
Intro to Andrew Breitbart's Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries	4
Remembering Andrew Breitbart	5
Breitbart Rule 1: Bring The Fight to the Enemy	6
Breitbart Rule 2: Expose the Left for Who They Are	8
Breitbart Rule 3: Be Open About Your Secrets	10
Breitbart Rule 4: Don't Let the Complex Use Its PC Lexicon to Characterize You and Shape the Narrative	12
Breitbart Rule 5: Control your own story - don't let the Complex do it	15
Breitbart Rule 6: Ubiquity is key	16
Breitbart Rule 7: Engage in the social arena	17
Breitbart Rule 8: Don't pretend to know more than you do	18
Breitbart Rule 9: Don't let them pretend to know more than they do	19
Breitbart Rule 10: Ridicule is man's most potent weapon	20
Breitbart Rule 11: Don't let them get away with ignoring their own rules	21
Breitbart Rule 12: Truth isn't mean. It's truth	22
Breitbart Rule 13: Believe in the Audacity of Hope	23
I am an Andrew Breitbart Conservative	25
CHAPTER 2: PART TWO: AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM	26
American Exceptionalism	27
American Exceptionalism (Part 2)	29
American Exceptionalism (Part 3)	30
American Exceptionalism (Part 4)	32
American Exceptionalism (Part 5)	34
American Exceptionalism (Part 6)	35

American Exceptionalism (Part 7)	37
What Makes a True American?	38
CHAPTER 3: PART THREE: THE 2012 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION	39
The 2012 election and talk of a third party	40
The 2012 election and talk of a third party (Part 2)	41
A vote for any but Romney is a vote for Obama	42
An open letter to ALL Registered Republicans	44
Paul Ryan is a perfect pick for Mitt Romney	46
Election 2012: ALL 50 states are up for grabs	47
An open letter to ALL Americans (Post-Convention Speech)	48
The Tea Party and this particular presidential election	49
The battle for America the next month (#WAR and #ThisMeans#WAR)	50
More on this Presidential Election	52
Even after the election, our work is not done	53
The death of America and who is to blame	54
An Open Letter to the Haters	56
Obama's Second Inauguration and America's Future	57
CHAPTER 4: PART FOUR: VARIOUS EDITORIALS	58
Time to give up, or time to fight on?	59
Time to give up, or time to fight on (Part 2)	60
Obama is no Reagan (he is no Clinton, either)	61
Impeaching Obama? Not a wise idea	62
An apology to the Founding Fathers	64
Elections are like College Football and Basketball Postseasons	66
The Tea Party	67
Online Social Media Tea Party	68
How the Right owns talk radio	69
End of the Year Retrospective	71
Merry Christmas! (from my Conservative Blog)	72
My thoughts on the horrific shooting in Connecticut	73
'Twas the night before Christmas - Marine style	74
The greatest danger to our freedom	76
Corey Clagett	78
Brett Kimberlin	79
#TwitterGulag and its ties to Brett Kimberlin	80
The Supreme Court Week in Review	82
The Liberal Mindset	83

Career Politicians	84
Do the Math	85
“Jefferson, I think we’re lost”	86
Never forget what happened 11 years ago	88
CHAPTER 5: PART FIVE: FOOTBALL AND THE AMERICAN CHARACTER	89
Football and the American Character	90
Football and the American Character (Part 2)	91
Football and the American Character (Part 3)	92
Football and the American Character (Part 4)	95
Football and the American Character (Part 5)	97
Football and the American Character (Part 6)	99
CHAPTER 6: PART SIX: FUTURE EDITORIALS	100
Executive Power in Wartime	101
Executive Power in Wartime (Part 2)	103
Executive Power in Wartime (Part 3)	104
Executive Power in Wartime (Part 4)	106
Executive Power in Wartime (Part 5)	107
Executive Power in Wartime (Part 6)	108
Executive Power in Wartime (Part 7)	110
CHAPTER 7: AFTERMATH	112

Introduction

The following is a collection of editorials from my radio talk show Red, Right, and Blue. I had done a couple of series on various topics, and will rewrite them here. Hope all enjoy!

Red, Right, and Blue is a political talk show hosted by Valerie Santiago and I (my former co-hosts on the show were Harriet Baldwin, Patricia Baber, and Billie Cotter) which airs on Saturdays at 1:30 PM Eastern, 12:30 PM Central, on a site called Own The Narrative. Right now the show is on hiatus as the producers of the show have offline issues to deal with. However, the show will be on BlogTalk Radio under the Not Politically Correct banner (which is run by former Red, Right, and Blue co-host Patricia Baber) temporarily until the producers handle their offline issues. What we do for two hours is go through the news and give our own take on it from the citizen's point of view from the right side of the political spectrum. We invite you to join us and engage the conversation when the show comes back on the air.

History of Red, Right, and Blue

Red, Right, and Blue started when I decided to branch out into the talk radio arena in September, 2011. At the time I was a DJ with DreamScape Radio over on a roleplay site called Portal of Dreams, and was a part of the Herman Cain Campaign with a few hundred other online supporters. I was an avid listener of a flagship show on Cain Nation Radio (Now called Conservative Nation Radio) on Blog Talk Radio and kept asking if I can have my own show. The host (who was also the purveyor of Cain Nation Radio) had kept saying he will think on it. Now at the time DreamScape Radio had an exclusivity clause to where any who DJ for them ONLY stay with them for everything online radio related, though I had come to find out later that was not the case. I had decided to resign from DreamScape Radio with the option of coming back after the 2012 election, as I was planning on only being a talk show host during the 2012 election season then return to DJ'ing right afterward. After a couple of months the host decided to grant me two hours of time a week, and so Red Right and Blue was started on February 26, 2012. In March, 2012, I was also a panelist for a show called TB-TV, which was started by a man who called himself Texas or Busted. On January 3, 2013, I was unceremoniously released from Conservative Nation Radio, and came to Own The Narrative full time starting my show that Saturday. I have had some memorable guests and interviews during the year that I have been on the air, talking to people like AJ Reissig - the author of *Escape to Freedom* - Melanie Dianiska - mother of Corey Claggett who is spending time in Fort Leavenworth for following orders - and Tony Katz - Tea Party Speaker and host of The Tony Katz Show every Saturday on 97.1 Talk out of St. Louis, Missouri.

CHAPTER 1

PART ONE: ANDREW BREITBART

The first series I am working on is on the Conservative Blogger and Citizen Journalist Andrew Breitbart. Born February 1, 1969, Breitbart is best known for his news aggregation website Breitbart.com which consisted of what he called “The Bigs,” also known as Breitbart.tv, Big Government, Big Hollywood, Big Education, and Big Peace. He also wrote two books: “Hollywood, Interrupted: Insanity Chic in Babylon - The Case Against Celebrity” (with Mark C. Ebner) as well as “Righteous Indignation: Excuse Me While I Save The World” as well as appearing as a commentator on various talk and news shows. He was a very frequent panelist on the Fox News Channel Late Night show “Red Eye with Greg Gutfeld.” He also appeared at the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC) from 2010 to 2012, most famously (or infamously) confronting the Occupy DC Protesters in 2012, which was his last “viral storm on the Web,” according to David Carr. Also during CPAC in 2010 Breitbart had a memorable confrontation with Daryle Jenkins of the One People’s Project.

Breitbart was married to Susannah Bean, daughter of famed Actor Orson Bean, and had four children. He was out walking his dog in the Brentwood section of Los Angeles, California, on March 1, 2012, and collapsed. He was rushed to Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center where he died at the age of 43 years old. Bill Whittle, a conservative blogger and commentator as well as a close friend of Breitbart, said he had a serious heart attack just months before his death.

Apologize for WHAT?

(Written February 2, 2013)

Yesterday would have been Andrew Breitbart's 44th birthdate. I admit I had not followed him all that much before watching his speech at CPAC last year, and I am kicking myself for that. However, in the 11 months since his unexpected death, I had been looking at all the videos and articles I could find on him, and even requested (and gotten) his book "Righteous Indignation" for Christmas.

In "Righteous Indignation," he had written a "Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries" where he lays out the rules which ever conservative activist needs to do in order to fight the left and also even those on our own side now. I mention those on our own side because of what happened during the last election cycle where many did not vote for Romney because of one reason or another. As Andrew said at CPAC last year (which had been my motto throughout the 2012 election season), "If you're not for this candidate, more than shame on you; you're on the other side."

Over the next 14 shows or so I am going to go through Andrew's Pragmatic Primer and say just what we could do in order to take back the Senate in 2014 and also possibly the White House in 2016. We had lost those two battles in 2012 but with enough inspiration and know-how we will win the #WAR in the future. That's right, ladies and gentlemen. I say to the left and even to those on our side who cost us the 2012 election, "#ThisMeansWAR!" After all, I think this is what that Andrew Breitbart, that happy warrior, that fearless warrior, would have wanted. This is how I will celebrate his 44th birthdate.

Alinsky v. Breitbart

(Written February 9, 2013)

In my 3 years of being involved politically, I had seen the war out there. However, it is not just conservative v. liberal as many think. In all actuality, it is Alinsky v. Breitbart.

What do I mean by the war is Alinsky v. Breitbart? The answer is complex but it is also simple. It is complex because of the media Complex that those on the left use. By the media Complex I am referring to not only the mainstream media but also the way they handle the news. For instance, the media in the northeast had been reporting on the blizzard but failed to report on the conservative march against gun control inside one of the state capitals. It is simple because we can SEE what they had been doing for some time.

The difference between then and now is that we had no way to combat it until now. And THAT is where Andrew Breitbart comes into play. In his book *Righteous Indignation*, he made mention of what Alinsky looked for in a community organizer as well as how he built his tactics. I will get into the full explanation of how Alinsky did that later, but to sum it up he lays out his plan for the “Have-Nots” against the “Haves” in his book *Rules for Radicals*.

While Alinsky had put out a way to divide America, Andrew Breitbart had put out a way to unite America. We have the will and capability. All we have to do is not be afraid to go out there and actually DO it.

Intro to Andrew Breitbart's Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries

(Written February 23, 2013)

On the webpage ANDREW BREITBART'S PRAGMATIC PRIMER FOR REALISTIC REVOLUTIONARIES, I had made the following mention by way of introduction:

Andrew Breitbart will forever be remembered for many things in his life, from going out to get the real dirt on the Occupy movement to speaking at Tea Party events. However, one main thing he will forever be known for is engaging the Liberals on their turf (see his appearance on Real Time with Bill Maher in 2009) and doing it with class and dignity. While many people deride Conservatives and Republicans for going on Liberal talk shows, Breitbart shows that we can walk into the Lions' Den and come out unscathed. He had written down rules (with an explanation as to why they should be used) that ALL Conservative activists need to use to use when fighting the left.

While I had not had the privilege and the honor of meeting Andrew Breitbart prior to his death in March, 2012, I felt a kindred spirit with him after hearing his legendary CPAC speech last year. If you had not heard it before, I encourage you to do so as he put himself on the wall and said that he would fight side by side with whoever would support our candidate, with the warning that anyone who is not supporting our candidate is on the other side. He had left us with good instructions to fight the progressive left in his book "Righteous Indignation: Excuse Me While I Save The World" which he had published in April, 2011. The instructions he had left us are found in Chapter 7 which is entitled "Pragmatic Primer For Realistic Revolutionaries." and is worth reading and applying to our daily lives.

Over the next 3 to 4 months I will spend one entry a week to speaking on one of the rules Andrew had written out and going over just how we can use it to our advantage in speaking to others. This will be a preparation for the fight for Congress in 2014 when we will challenge for the Senate and defend the House. Also, this will be good for the fight for the White House in 2016 when we will support whoever we can during the primaries and then ultimately come together and put up a united front, supporting the Republican nominee against whoever the Democrats roll out to try to succeed Obama.

Remembering Andrew Breitbart

(Written March 2, 2013)

On March 7, 2012, I had written this blog entry paying tribute to Andrew Breitbart.

I know we are only 65 days into the year, and we lost a great Conservative Patriot 6 days ago, but this has to be said. If there is anything we will take away from this year, it is the tag of #IAMBreitbart, just like 2011 was the year of #IAMJohnGalt in memory of the movie “Atlas Shrugged: Part 1” which opened on April 15, 2011.

I might not have met Andrew Breitbart, but had seen him on Red Eye with Greg Gutfeld and also in a few YouTube videos where he confronted the Occupy Wall street people as well as some who opposed the Tea Party. Through those incidents I feel as if I had known Andrew Breitbart, and will uphold his legacy of citizen journalism and blow the whistle on those who seek to cause harm to the country.

It has been a year ago today that he had died, and those words ring true today as they did back then. Andrew Breitbart was a happy warrior, one who knew that in order to win the political war you first have to conquer and win the cultural war.

Last month, I had written the blog entry Alinsky vs. Breitbart and based on what I had seen over the past year from those on the Left and even from those on the Right, it just goes to show that I was right. This battle is not conservative v. liberal or even Republican v. Democrat. Rather, it is Saul Alinsky v. Andrew Breitbart. Barack Obama has been so successful in using Alinsky tactics to further divide and tear this country apart that at times it seems like nobody will be able to stand up to him. Well Andrew Breitbart had provided the tools to stand up to Obama and push back against the false narratives in his book Righteous Indignation: Excuse Me While I Save the World for us to use. We just have to actually go out there and DO it and not be afraid of whatever the consequences might be. The question is: Will you be willing to stand with me in using those tactics to fight the Alinsky tactics, or are you against me? Like Andrew said at CPAC last year, “If you’re not in that bunker because you’re not satisfied with a certain candidate, more than shame on you! You’re on the other side!” While there is no nominee to stand behind now, the fight still wages on. Andrew said this is a #WAR; I say #ThisMeansWAR. The internet is our battleground; our keyboards, cell phones, webcams, digital cameras, and iPods are the weapons we use. Andrew paved the way for us, now let’s go out there and make him proud of his work.

Breitbart Rule 1: Bring The Fight to the Enemy

The first rule Andrew had written in his Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries is to not be afraid to go into enemy territory, saying the following:

1.) Don't be afraid to go into enemy territory: This is the most important rule you'll read in this book, and the one most likely to be ignored by the Republican Party and the Old Guard in the conservative movement. They would say I shouldn't have appeared on Maher, because it was an audience stacked against me. But that's the same mentality that led me right to abandon Hollywood, academia, and the media - and the effects have been disastrous. The right figures that talk radio, Fox News, and some independent Internet sites will allow us to distribute our ideas to the masses. There's one problem: those outlets are exponentially outnumbered and outgunned by the Complex. They're Alinsky-ed by the activist left, which insists Fox News is Faux News and talk radio is hate radio. Obama is leading the charge, targeting specific hosts and specific outlets. Remember Rush Limbaugh? Or their insistence that Fox News isn't a real news outlet like CNN or MSNBC?

The problem is that it works with the vast majority of apolitical voters in America. In my neighborhood, our strategy of disengagement isn't working too well. People who don't watch Fox News or listen to Rush have strong, defiant, negative opinions about those outlets, just like I did when I was a liberal. I'd never listened to Rush in my life, but I knew - I knew! - that Rush was the epitome of evil. I knew, just as the Complex wanted me to know, that Rush was a racist, sexist, homophobic bigot that only KKKers listened to while driving their broken down pickups and drinking moonshine.

The army of the emboldened and gleefully ill-informed is growing. Groupthink happens, and we have to take it head-on. We can't win the political war until we win the cultural war. The Frankfurt School knew that - that's why they won the cultural war and then, on its back, the political war. We can do the same, but we have to be willing to enter the arena. By neglecting The View or, worse, by ignoring Jon Stewart, Stephen Colbert, Maher, and David Letterman - we allow them to distort and demean us as they romanticize and elevate themselves. It's harder to attack people to their faces than behind their backs. and we have to confront them face-to-face. Young people suckle at the teat of pop culture - but by refusing to fight for their attention, we lose by default.

Our most articulate voices, likable faces, and best idea-makers need to go into hostile territory and plant the seeds of doubt in our ideological enemy and the apolitical masses who simply go with the media flow. Our babysitter has an Obama bumper sticker on her car, but admits she knows nothing about politics. How did that happen? It's what the complex tells her to do to be cool. We have to use their media control against them by walking into the lion's den, heads held high, proud of who we are and what we stand for.

There's no time to continue backing away. If we're standing still we're moving backward. Get in the game. Get in the fight.

During the 2012 presidential campaign, I had seen posts on Facebook and Twitter bemoaning the fact that New Gingrich, Mitt Romney, Herman Cain, and other Republicans and conservatives had given interviews on CNN, MSNBC, CBS News, ABC News, and other liberal stations and talk show hosts. Rather than bemoaning them, we should have celebrated them for doing so. As I had mentioned last week, the liberals won the cultural war and then the political war. We need to take back the cultural war, and we cannot do that if we remain in our small sphere and not engage the liberals on their battlefield.

Back in 1994 or so I had read a book by InterVarsity Press (a part of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship) entitled *Out of the Saltshaker & into the World* by Rebecca Manley Pippert. The book deals with evangelism. However, after reading Andrew's Pragmatic Primer Rule 1, I also thought of this because just as *Get out of the Saltshaker* dealt with getting out of the church and into the world, what Andrew is saying is our best and brightest conservative minds need to get off of Fox News and conservative talk shows and go on shows like Piers Morgan, Hardball, Meet the Press with David Gregory, The Daily Show with John Stewart, Real Time with Bill Maher, The View, and others to get our word out there. While most of us are not of the caliber to go on those shows, there is one way we can do it. We need to actually go and engage the culture in the malls, the parks, anywhere we can.

When I was involved in InterVarsity Christian Fellowship back in 1993 and 1994, one person would always point to the door before he left the meeting and say "The mission field is right out that door there." His basis for that was from the Bible where in Isaiah 6:8 God asked "Whom will I send, and who will go for us?" and Isaiah said "Here am I. Send me." I am here to say that the battlefield for the hearts and minds of Americans, nay, the WORLD, is the Internet as well as right in our own backyards. The question is will you stand on the sidelines and retreat to the safety of Fox News and conservative talk shows, or will you get out there and join in the fight?

Breitbart Rule 2: Expose the Left for Who They Are

Continuing with Andrew Breitbart's Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries, here is his explanation for Rule #2:

2.) Expose the left for who they are - in their own words: It's easy to label the left, to analyze them, to take them apart using your rationality - their program fails every time it's tried, and their lexicon, once you know it, is as predictable as the sun rising in the east. What's much harder than understanding the left is exposing it.

That's where citizen journalists come in. Drudge was a citizen journalist, and he took on a president. Today, we all have the power to be citizen journalists via the internet - there's no Complex gatekeeper to stop us from posting the truth about enemies of freedom and liberty in this country. In the past few years alone, citizen journalists have deposed Dan Rather for his scurrilous and baseless attacks on George W. Bush; exposed John Kerry's true war record during the 2004 election cycle; debunked Reuters' photography fraud in the Middle East; raised the question whether Barack Obama's autobiography, *Dreams from My Father*, was ghostwritten by domestic terrorist Bill Ayers; gotten rid of communist Van Jones; and the list goes on. The Internet has become the shining beacon of journalistic freedom, tearing apart congressional bills piece by piece for the benefit of the public, even when our own legislators won't read them.

The key to the success of the New Media, though, is making news by breaking news. And that means that conservatives need to use their new best technological friends: the MP3 recorder, the phone camera, and the blogosphere. It's one thing to say that the left likes socialism, but it's a real story to get Barack Obama to admit it on camera, as he did to Joe the Plumber during the 2008 election cycle. Video journalism is the most potent kind of journalism. We live in an age of sound and light, not text, and we have to adapt to that age.

You are the soldiers in this war against the Institutional Left. You have been issued your weapons. Go out and use them. Make it impossible for the Complex to ignore you.

I find it a little bit ironic but mayhap led by Andrew himself that this rule is being written during CPAC 2013 for the simple reason that the speakers and panelists are empowering us with the skills and tactics to go up against the Left. The war is the Mainstream Media (who employ Alinsky tactics) v. the Citizen Journalist (who employ Breitbart tactics) first and foremost. And judging by the speakers Thursday, yesterday and today I personally have never felt more empowered to take on the Mainstream Media and hold them accountable for putting the politicians' feet to the fire.

Even though I was not able to attend CPAC in person, I had followed the proceedings on Twitter (with the hashtag #CPAC2013) and also in a chatroom from Right Scoop's Live Feed of CPAC 2013, and I dare say that all of the

speeches were wonderful. The speakers I had heard definitely fired me up and inspired me to continue this fight through my blogs and this radio show as well as my New Media venture.

I will go more into the speakers later in the show, but all I have to say is after listening to the speakers over the past three days, the liberals had better be very afraid. We will never EVER forget what happened on November 6. In fact, that only served to embolden many of us to do all we can to call out the liberals and any on our own side who support Obama's policies. I know I am emboldened to do my part. Who will stand with me in that bunker defending those who spoke and in a sense are on that wall defending our freedom?

Breitbart Rule 3: Be Open About Your Secrets

One of the things that Andrew had mentioned in his Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries is to put everything out in the open. In fact, that is his third rule

3.) Be open about your secrets: If you're going to go out in public, be absolutely open about what you've done in the past. Take a page from Barack Obama, who revealed in his probably Ayers-ghostwritten autobiography that he had done a lot of blow, and hung out with commies and assorted lowlifes. Once it was out there, there wasn't much that the right could do with it - he'd already admitted it.

By way of contrast, take a look at Mark Foley. If he'd admitted he was gay right off the bat, the left wouldn't have had much to pillory him with. The left never gets cited for hypocrisy (see Clinton, Bill), but the right is cited with it all the time because we actually have standards. That means we have to out ourselves before the left does it for us. In this book, I've already admitted to libertine sensibilities that were taken to absurd heights during my collegiate stint in New Orleans. I am not a puritan. Frankly, John Waters's movies and Johnny Knoxville's Jackass series are more up my alley than Mel Gibson's *The Passion of the Christ*. The days of the left forcing us into a small, monolithic, and monochromatic box are over, and we have to fight their caricature of us.

Actually, George W. Bush did the same thing during the 2000 election. "When I was young and stupid, I was young and stupid," he said. Once he had come clean, the Left was stuck - they couldn't do anything.

Hypocrisy is such a powerful argument for the left because it appeals directly to the emotional heart of politics: one standard for you, another for me. It's no wonder Alinsky relied heavily on his rule 4: Make the enemy live up to their own book of rules. We have more rules than they do with regard for morality, which means we have to live up to them more often. But mistakes in the past don't need to be skeletons waiting to come out of the closet. If you've made mistakes, reveal them at the first available opportunity. Embrace those mistakes. Don't talk about how you regret them - talk about how you lived through them and how they made you who you are today. Embracing your mistakes makes you invulnerable to their slings.

Just don't screw up badly now.

One thing to remember is that we are all human and we all make mistakes. What we do not do is embrace and move on from them. The liberals have concealed their mistakes and moved on from them, though if it were a conservative or a Republican that committed those same mistakes, they would be strung up by their shorthairs over it. THAT is the main difference between them and us. What they do is lie about it and cover it up then when they do come up a year or a decade later they always deny it OR they pull a Hillary and say "What difference does it make NOW?" What we should do is embrace the mistakes and put them out there in the open and say "yes I did this. However, I

learned from it and grew into a better person because of it.” Liberals are kind of like the bully who picks on others in school because they are insecure in themselves OR they feel that if they cannot be happy then none else can be happy. Conservatives are kind of like that child who got straight A’s but if there is one blemish on their record they admit it and then move on from it. The slings and the barbs from the bully liberals will be rendered useless once we embrace our blemishes and move on to better ourselves.

Breitbart Rule 4: Don't Let the Complex Use Its PC Lexicon to Characterize You and Shape the Narrative

Andrew Breitbart was a lightning rod to the left, and he reveled in it so much that he made it Rule 4 in his Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries:

4.) Don't let the Complex use its PC lexicon to characterize you and shape the narrative: If you've got a big story, the Complex will do what it always does: attack you personally using the PC lexicon. You immediately become a racist, sexist, homophobic, jingoistic nativist. Don't let them do it. The fact is this: if you refuse to buy into their lexicon, if you refuse to back down in the face of those intimidation tactics, they can't harm you. You're Neo in the hallway with Agent Smith after he figures out that the Complex is a sham - the spoon isn't bending, he's bending. Once it hits him that he's not bound by the rules of the game, he can literally stop bullets. You can stop their bullets because their bullets aren't real.

Leftist assassins like Max Blumenthal, a one-trick hit man, have tried to label me and many of my allies as racists. I don't let them get away with it. I don't just call them out. I make sure that my righteous indignation registers on the Richter scale. I don't pull out my record on civil rights or my black friends. I simply point out that what they're doing is pure Alinsky and that it has no basis in fact or reality, and that they're showing themselves to be racists in their own right by citing race every time they meet someone with whom they disagree.

While I was at the 2010 CPAC, I was confronted by Daryle Jenkins of the One People's Project based on my defense of James O'Keefe - he had been slandered online as a racist by Blumenthal because he had attended a conference at the Georgetown Law Center that included racist Jared Taylor, John Derbyshire of NATIONAL REVIEW (who ripped into Taylor for his racism during the forum), and African-American conservative Kevin Martin. At the event, O'Keefe sided with Derbyshire and Martin against Taylor.

Anyway, here's how the incident went down:

Breitbart: Max Blumenthal is a political hit man. What he does is he rapes the reputation of people mercilessly. He makes scurrilous, unsupportable accusations against people and he smears them using the political correctness he learned so well in the post-modern academy and the politics of personal destruction he learned firsthand from his father, Sid "Vicious" Blumenthal. He destroys people. He isolates threats to the reign of the far left and the reign of his father's cabal of Clinton/Podesta and the organized left. He's a vicious guy. He falsely slandered James O'Keefe as a racist, we disproved it -

Jenkins: How did you disprove it, sir?

Breitbart: I'm being interviewed right here.

Jenkins: I'm the one who put that story out there first.

Breitbart: Well, then, you suck.

Jenkins: You're lying. You're lying ... He was at that white supremacist forum.

Breitbart: It wasn't a white supremacist forum.

Jenkins: Yes it was!

Breitbart: Then why was Kevin Martin there?

At this point, Jenkins started pointing his finger inches from my face and moving his face close to mine. It then devolved into a series of accusations regarding details of the event. Finally, Jenkins got to his point:

Breitbart: Are you accusing me of being a white supremacist?

Jenkins: I'm accusing you of being a racist, yes I am.

Breitbart: Okay, have a nice day, buddy. Will somebody please take this guy out of here? You punk.

That was it. Jenkins walked away.

The key to the conversation was that I didn't start defending myself against his baseless charge of racism. I dismissed it out of hand as ridiculous because it was ridiculous. He was a punk for leveling that kind of charge without any basis whatsoever. I don't let my enemies characterize me without any evidence, and you shouldn't let them characterize you. Name-calling is their best strategy, and if you don't lend it credence, and instead force them to back up their charges with specifics, you win. Revel in the name calling - it means you've got them reduced to their lowest, basest tactic, and the one that carries the least weight if you refuse to abide by their definition of you.

There had been many times I was called racist or un-American for posting articles against Obama. The reason (according to those who called me racist) is because I do not like Obama because he is black. As Martin Luther King Jr. said during his famous "I have a Dream" speech, there should be a day when people are judged not on the color of their skin but on the content of their character. And judging on Obama's past, it is clear that the content of his character is bad for America. However, many people only see skin color and as such they do not see the content of the character.

Currently I am battling many who say Marco Rubio (and now even Ted Cruz) are not eligible for president because they are not a natural-born citizen, and have even been accused of being an O-bot or an Obama supporter. Those people are even accusing me of using Saul Alinsky tactics. I tell them to back up their claim and some of them do, but on the majority many are held silent because they realized they had been forced to using low, base tactics to back up their claims.

When I am called names because I do not support Obama or any liberal for that matter, I calmly (at first) let them know that they have no specific claim to back up their charge. Then I move on to saying that they really have no claim if they resort to name-calling. Then and only then do we win and put the Complex on their heels, thereby owning the narrative which they tried to shape on us.



Breitbart Rule 5: Control your own story - don't let the Complex do it

(Written April 6, 2013)

Just as Andrew Breitbart did not let the Complex use its PC Lexicon to control him and shape the narrative, he then went one step further and did not let the Complex control whatever story he had. I present to you, Rule 5 in his Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries.

5.) Control your own story - don't let the Complex do it: A one-and-done story isn't worth anything. One fact can be posted on the Internet and flushed down the memory hole faster than anyone can imagine. How many incredible pieces of journalistic revelation have been lost because they weren't properly presented to the public?

Serialization is good. Van Jones was taken down by Glenn Beck because Beck had the goods - and because he revealed them piece by piece. He got Jones and his defenders to come out of the closet and attack him. Then he calmly laid his cards on the table, one by one.

It's the same strategy I saw Arianna pursue during the Larry Lawrence scandal. People came out of the woodwork to attack her as a scurrilous human being slandering a dead war hero. And she smiled and let them come at her. Then she put her evidence into the public eye bit by bit, keeping the story alive. Feeding the media is like training a dog - you can't throw an entire steak to a dog to train it to sit. You have to give it little bits of steak over and over and over again until it learns its lesson. That's what Arianna did.

It's the same thing Drudge did with Lewinsky. He broke the story in pieces rather than in a long essay laying out all the facts, and he didn't let the media's cries for him to reveal all his information control his decision-making process. Instead, he controlled the media.

The important thing to remember here is that the media are like a leech hanging on the back of the news makers, and the news makers have every right and ability to feed that leech little by little instead of letting it suck them dry all at once. Keep your story alive by planning its release down to the minutest level.

The main thing to remember is this: we need to OWN THE NARRATIVE at every single opportunity. I am of the belief that owning the narrative is not just a fancy saying or something that can be focused on for an hour or so a day or even a week. Rather, owning the narrative is a way of life, one that lives with us 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 52 weeks a year. Owning the narrative has been a part of my life ever since Andrew died, and it will remain in me until I take that eternal celestial dirt nap.

During the 2012 election I had dealt with the third party supporters, as I had mentioned last week, and every time they said something which mentioned Romney and Obama being the same I just calmly said they are not and showed them links a little at a time. In fact, one person even called me Rick "The Narrative" Bulow because when he would ask me what I am doing, I told him that I am calmly owning the narrative.

When Marco Rubio was mentioned on Romney's VP short list and the birthers came out of the woodwork saying he is not eligible, I had calmly said that he is, and debunked their articles a little at a time with certain links of my own. And in fact just recently I had seen a thread on a site which mentioned a paper from the Congressional Research Service on natural born citizenship and presidential eligibility. Now what is funny about it is that I had brought up that paper in another thread on the same site and got bashed for it. So I had waded in and mentioned a couple of things about eligibility, and wound up getting banned from the entire site. Am I upset about it? Yes I am; however, one thing I did not do when I commented was let them own and control the narrative. The only way the Complex can own and control the narrative after being confronted with facts is to shut you up. And online, apparently that means banning someone from sites.

If we want to win in 2014 and then in 2016, we have to own the narrative, whatever it may be, at all costs. Remember that owning the narrative is not just a fancy saying but a way of life.

Breitbart Rule 6: Ubiquity is key

(Written April 13, 2013) It is one thing to own the narrative. It is another to KEEP the narrative going. And for that you might need a little help. Hence, Rule 6 in Andrew Breitbart's Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries. 6.) Ubiquity is key: As a capitalist and as a web publisher, pageviews are a desired commodity. But when playing for political or cultural keeps, impact matters most. And, when ABCNBCCBSCNNMSNBC and the dailies are working against you and ignoring you, ubiquity is a key weapon That means developing relationships with like-minded allies or even enemies and news junkies and allowing them to share in the good fortune of a good scoop. While the crux of a story can be weaponized and launched on one of my websites, there are often peripheral angles that can be developed elsewhere with a separate but related media life of their own. For instance, the acorn story was unbelievably complex. A key component of exposing the scandal was a detailed analysis of ACORN's structure and its past scandals. I knew legal minds were needed to weigh in on these aspects. Patrick Frey, who runs the indispensable Patterico website, created a parallel line of attack, not just against ACORN, but against its myriad defenders, who lied and misdirected to try to kill the story. The ACORN story couldn't have been the success it was without others - talk radio and alternative news outlets that were invested in the story and could deliver scoops of their own. So I planted scoops with what business school types would call my "competitors," and I watched the story explode, my pageviews would go through the roof, and my brand flourish. Sometimes the best ideas are counterintuitive. I love living in Los Angeles and not DC, because in DC there are too many fighting over too little ground for their own fifteen minutes. The scarcity mentality is strangling the growth of the conservative movement. From outside DC, I can see that ubiquity is about growing the pie for everyone, spreading the stories, the channels of distribution, the resources around so that the entire movement can benefit, because our chunk of the public square gets bigger and bigger each time we break something huge. While we all have different viewpoints or perspectives as to what conservatism is, one thing to remember is that we are all in the same fight. That is what the Left does, and they succeed by coming together for a common purpose. The problem is that conservatives are so divided that it gives the Left a chance to gain the edge on the narrative. Note what Andrew had said: "developing relationships with like-minded allies or even enemies and news junkies and allowing them to share in the good fortune of a good scoop." That means spread it around. If you find something newsworthy, it does not help to keep it to yourself. Rather, post it on your social media tools and get the word out there. In next week's editorial I will go more into how to engage in social media as Andrew has it as his Rule 7, but developing relationships with like-minded people who are also news junkies can allow them to share in the fortune of a good scoop is key. One of my good friends who likes to share in the fortune of a good story is Patricia Baber, who used to be my co-host on this very show. She is one who hunts down stories on relatively unknown sites and put them out on Twitter, then it gets picked up by her followers and spreads to others. I even do the same thing when I do my news aggregates on my rant blog. But on that I do not take all the credit for it but rather give credit to Robert Stacy McCain of The Other McCain who has a blog entry entitled "How to Get a Million Hits on Your Blog." In fact, Stacy has Rule 2 which he calls the "Full Metal Jacket Reach-Around" where he says: Reciprocal linkage is the essential lubricant that makes the blogosphere purr with contentment. If somebody's throwing you traffic, you should either (a) give them a link-back update, or at a minimum (b) keep them in mind for future linkage. Because you don't want to end up on the wrong end of a kharmic unbalance in the 'sphere, where you're always taking and never giving. The Other McCain has a whole plethora of articles and the like to link to on your own blogs and also on Social Media outlets. I know I usually do it, but the past couple weeks I had slacked off because of certain things away from the computer. However, I am making a concerted effort to go back to doing it. The key is, will you be ubiquitous or will you be a loner in this war?

Breitbart Rule 7: Engage in the social arena

(Written April 20, 2013)

One of the best things I like about Andrew Breitbart in the short time I had followed him on Twitter prior to his untimely death is how engaged he was on Twitter. And with that in mind, he made Twitter (and indeed Social Media as a whole) one of the key points and rules in his Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries.

7.) Engage in the social arena: My first instinct about Facebook was my first instinct about Twitter was my first instinct about MySpace. I was right about MySpace - it sucks. I was definitely wrong about Facebook and Twitter.

Using my “ubiquity” rule, the citizen journalist isn’t always reporting in the ledes, headlines, and paragraphs form. Sometimes a tweet or a re-tweet can grant an idea more legs. Sometimes a status update can lead to the mother lode. Yes, there are slick advisers falsely promising a social networking Gold Rush, but well-socially-networked person can soon carry more weight than a household-name columnist at your local news daily.

Building a movement used to take time, but now it can be done in a few hours with with the right connections and the right posts on a few websites. Take, for example, flash mobs. These are gatherings spawned over the Internet on hours’ notice, and they gather thousands of people, whether it’s for snowball fights or for rioting in the streets of Philadelphia.

The Tea Parties have used the power of social media to get their message out there in a new and incredible way. There are no leaders to the Tea Party, which is a great thing, and there’s no formal program to the Tea Party - it’s truly a party of the people, and originally, it was based on conservative people partying. If any liberal attended a Tea Party event, they’d be shocked to see that it isn’t a KKK rally; it’s a social gathering of thousands of like-minded people of all races and ages, people looking for others who believe in the same values.

It’s also particularly true in Hollywood, where socializing is the basis of business. That’s why I’ve tried to put people in Hollywood together, and it’s already spawning actual creative projects. Seek out other people and build an army.

If you think on it, this rule is a culmination of the three prior rules. After all, Andrew’s fourth rule was about not letting the Complex use their PC lexicon to characterize you and shape the narrative, which is what the Left has been known to do on Social Media. His fifth rule was about us controlling our own story and not letting the Complex do it, which is all about owning the narrative. And to wrap up the trifecta, his sixth rule was all about ubiquity being the key to keeping the narrative. Now, what is one way to do all of this? The best way I can think of is by using the power of Social Media to defeat the Left and own and keep the narrative.

On today’s show, I will be having a panel on this very topic. On it will be the following:

John LaRosa - Partner of Four Tier Strategies, LLC (<http://www.fourtierstrategies.com/>)

Stephen Maloney - Admin of a few Marco Rubio groups, former Romney supporter, Social Media advocate

Miryam Shabak - Admin of the Facebook Group Help GOP Master New Media 4 Victory

Diane Sori - Purveyor of The Patriot Factor (<http://thepatriotfactor.blogspot.com/>)

Breitbart Rule 8: Don't pretend to know more than you do

(Written April 27, 2013)

After giving us a few tips on owning the narrative, Andrew Breitbart also gave us a few tips on how to keep the narrative. Here is Rule 8 in his Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries.

8.) Don't pretend to know more than you do: This one trips up conservatives all the time. We want to argue policy because when we know policy, there's no way they can beat us, because all they have is their lexicon of name-calling and societal expulsion. We have reason on our side.

But just because we have reason on our side doesn't mean that everyone is quipped to be Charles Krauthammer or Michael Barone, policy wonks who can pull facts from the Office of Management and Budget out of every orifice. Most of us aren't experts on the latest budget package or stem-cell line regulation, but that doesn't mean we're powerless - it means we get to play Socrates, asking pointed questions rather than citing facts we may not be sure of.

One of the low points of my media life was getting a call after the nomination of John Roberts for the United States Supreme Court. A producer from CNN's now-cancelled Aaron Brown Show asked me to go on TV and discuss the wisdom of President Bush's choice. I remember taking a Civil Liberties course at Tulane in summer school. As I recall there was a case called *Mapp v. Ohio*. That was the extent of my then-qualifications to pontificate on such legal matters. I am not sure what demoralized me more: that I was asked to do so by a leading cable news network, or that I readily accepted. Had Wikipedia not been invented, I would have had nothing to say. But I did, and I survived. My takeaway from the revealing moment about the low standards for TV punditry was that if I valued my career, I would only accept media invites where I could dictate the terms of engagement (i.e., bring my own stories, my own perspectives, etc.) or where I could change the subject to war footing.

By avoiding talking about that which I do not know, perhaps I limit my ability to appear on more shows. But I definitely limit my ability to screw up.

Put another way: don't be the guy with a knife at a gunfight. It rarely ends well. Now this is VERY important in the arena of social media as we look at Facebook, Twitter, and the various message boards and sites that we visit. There are many people out there who claim that they know it all and that their way is the best, but is it really? Now I will get more into that in next week's editorial but one thing I will say about it is that we might not know everything, but we need to not pretend or give others the false impression that we do. This is where research comes in. Many out there do not take the time to go into the research and actually back up what they talk about with facts or they do but get it all jumbled up. We need to do our research every time we find an idea or a narrative that people are putting out as false and then disprove it with what we had researched. Then and only then can we beat the progressives and the Alinskyites at their own game.

Breitbart Rule 9: Don't let them pretend to know more than they do

(Written May 4, 2013)

Just as we should not pretend to know more than we do, as I had discussed last week, we should not let the Left pretend to know more than they do. Hence Rule 9 in Andrew Breitbart's Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries:

9.) Don't let them pretend to know more than they do: This is really the converse of the last rule. Your opponents will pretend to be experts if you don't, but that's okay, because you can always puncture their balloon with one word: why. Asking them to provide evidence for their assertions is always fun, and it's even more fun asking them to provide the sources for that evidence. Attacking the fundamental basis of their arguments is fun, too - if they tell you health care is a right, ask why. Liberals don't have a why, other than their own utopianism and their dyspeptic view of the status quo and America. Reason is not their strong suit - emotion is. Force them to play on the football field of reason.

As Andrew said, there is one word which we can use to puncture the false narrative propagated by the left, and even a few kooks on our own side. That word is why, a simple three-letter word with a lot of power and oomph behind it. If we ask why they think that, then they will have to come up with a reason. As we all know, reason is not their strong suit because they always rely on emotion. Granted, the kooks on our own side say their strong suit is reason, but in the conversations I have had with them, it seems like they do not have a reason except "Read the Constitution!" and "We need to get back to the Constitution!"

THIS is where doing research and knowing what we are talking about comes into play. The more research we do and the more we know, the better we can be at puncturing the false narrative that is out there. I know that in my own conversations at first I had not had a lot of good research on my side to puncture their balloon, but over the past year I had read and listed all of the sites and articles I had read. This way, if people say something that I know is false, I go right to a certain article and show them where they are in error.

This is also handy in the classic "He said, She said" cases as well. One thing I had been doing since 2006 is saving every conversation I have with people, whether in a chatroom or even on instant messenger. This way if they say something which they had been corrected on in the past I can go right to the file and say that this had been talked about before and that they were wrong then and are still wrong.

We have the tools to force our opponents to play on the football field of reason. The thing of it is do we have the WILLPOWER to confront them and force them to play on that football field of reason, or are we afraid to do it?

Breitbart Rule 10: Ridicule is man's most potent weapon

(Written May 11, 2013)

It is rare to see someone on the right agree with Alinsky, but in studying him and also Rule For Radicals, it is clear that Andrew Breitbart had found a way to use Alinsky's rules to OUR advantage. Hence Rule 10 in his Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries:

10.) Ridicule is man's most potent weapon: Here, Alinsky and I agree. It's the truest of Alinsky's statements, and it's the most effective. Tina Fey, not the MSM, sullied Sarah Palin's image. Chevy Chase brought down Gerald Ford. Jon Stewart brought down Bush.

And we'll bring down Obama, but not unless we're willing to get unserious. Stuffy old white guys wearing bow ties and talking about the danger of national deficits don't get much done - talented people who can translate political chaos into merry pranksterism do.

We have seen the Left roll out a few people to impersonate our presidents or even political heroes. Case in point is Tina Fey with the legendary Saturday Night Live skit where she impersonated Sarah Palin with the ever popular saying "I can see Russia from my House" which many low-information voters think that those words actually came from Sarah Palin's mouth.

That video goes to show that the Left has the keys to pull out the merry pranksterism on America and get away with it. That is one of the ways they won in 2008 and again in 2012. We have to turn the tables and take the merry pranksterism away from them. I had seen a couple of ways that we could do it. One main person who can do such is Reggie Brown who does a WONDERFUL impersonation of Barack Obama.

Another way is what the WWE had done to promote Capitol Punishment, their Pay Per View which was held in Washington DC in June 2011. They had spliced some clips of Obama's press conferences with questions pertaining to their Pay Per View.

We can do the same in our own way, but the key is to not just talk about it but actually DO it. Instead of being a stuffed shirt spouting off numbers and pretending like we know what we are talking about, we need to let our hair down and just have some fun doing what we do best.

Breitbart Rule 11: Don't let them get away with ignoring their own rules

(Written May 18, 2013)

Not only did Andrew Breitbart say Alinsky was right about ridicule being man's most potent weapon, he also agreed with Alinsky on another rule. Hence, Rule 11 in the Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries.

11.) Don't let them get away with ignoring their own rules: Alinsky is right again. They set up this PC Complex, and they have to be held accountable to it, if only for honesty's sake, and we're the only ones who will do it. Joe Biden is still vice president of the United States even though he called the first black president "clean" and "articulate." Harry Reid is still Senate majority leader even though he said Obama was "light-skinned" and could drop his "Negro dialect" on cue. Until his death in 2010, Robert Byrd was "a lion of the Senate" even though he was a former Kleagle of the KKK. If these had been Republicans, they would have been hounded from office. They're Democrats, so they're not.

But that doesn't mean we can't hold them responsible for breaching their own standards. Every time they say things like this, we need to force them to back down and apologize, and we can't allow their allies to let them off the hook with excuses about how they stood for the right policies. Frankfurt School tactics can't work here - standing for liberalism doesn't mean you're allowed to violate the conventions of PC. At the very least, we need to force these hypocrites to stand up against their own PC regime in order to defend themselves.

Over the past 10 years or so, there had been a vast difference in the way Republicans and Democrats are handled. Among the ones I can think of:

Trent Lott (Republican from Mississippi) was forced out of the Senate Republican Leadership because of his words at the celebration of Strom Thurmond's (Republican from South Carolina) 100th birthdate.

Mark Foley (Republican from Florida's 16th District) resigned from the House because he was caught in bed with a minor.

John Ensign (Republican from Nevada) resigned from the Senate because of ethics violations. These were forced out of office while the Democrats only get a slap on the wrist. What makes these three different from the Democrats Andrew mentioned in his rule? The fact that the Democrats can do anything, even get away with murder (a la Hillary Clinton with Vince Foster and Whitewater, or Obama with the Ambassador and company in Benghazi as well as Navy SEAL Team 6 which killed Osama Bin Laden) at every turn.

We need to turn the tables on the Democrats and make them live by the EXACT SAME set of rules that they expect us to live by. If we do not, then they will run roughshod. In sports, both teams play by the same set of rules. It is time those in politics do the same thing.

Breitbart Rule 12: Truth isn't mean. It's truth

(Written May 25, 2013)

As Andrew Breitbart had come to the close of his Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries, he brings about a VERY important issue and rule which many on the left do NOT want to think about, which is why they rely on Alinsky Tactics and smears.

12.) Truth isn't mean. It's truth: I know that some of you are going to feel rotten about using some of these tactics. We can ignore the tactics, but the left will continue to use them to their benefit; just as the Frankfurt School relied on the good nature and honesty of Americans who wouldn't engage in un-Christian tactics in order to achieve their massive victory, the left continues to rely on our honesty and aboveboard good nature in order to achieve theirs.

We can't let them.

We start by uncovering the truth and telling everyone about it. I'm not religious, and I'm certainly no theologian, but if there is one thing in religion that speaks to me, it is the idea of absolute truth. In fact, the word truth has meaning only if it's absolute. And absolute truth will set us free from the grip of the Complex, because the Complex lives in the clouds, in the theoretical heavens - the Frankfurt School was successful only because they were able to shift Marxism's basis from real-world predictions to descriptions of supposed historical processes, making Marxism unfalsifiable. We have to falsify their theory by presenting unvarnished truth after unvarnished truth until the light dawns on everyone just how right we are.

In my travels on Twitter, I have met many who spread lies about anything and everything, and when I confront them with the truth they call me racist, mean, or say that I don't know what I'm talking about. Then when I provide them with links which show where I know what I am referring to they proceed to say that the site or blog has errors even though it is a HIGHLY REPUTABLE site which many use. One of the many things I also like to bring up is that "Common sense dictates ..." which I use to say that those who even have any sort of common sense and decency would look at what is read and determine for themselves if it is true or not. Sometimes people just need a 10 pound sledgehammer of common sense upside the head or a cheese grater of decency right in the yambag region to see that what they had said or read has been wrong. However, there are times in which you have to use it on people more than once to try to get it to sink in. No matter what, we need to reach out to people with the truth, and for those who do not want to hear it, well all we have to do is channel our inner Jack Nicholson from A Few Good Men and let them have it.

Breitbart Rule 13: Believe in the Audacity of Hope

(Written June 1, 2013)

Andrew Breitbart has given us all the tools to help defeat the Complex, but he gives us one more thing to believe in. Hence his 13th and final rule in the Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries.

13.) Believe in the audacity of hope: It's too bad President Obama is such a joyless, politically correct automaton, because he's terrifically agile with his prepared words. To paraphrase his victory speech after the 2008 election, the rise of the New Media alone is not the change we seek - it is only the chance for us to make that change. And that cannot happen if we go back to the way things were. It cannot happen without you.

It can't happen without hope for America and faith in its people - two things Obama and his leftist ilk don't have, which is why they try to shut it down in others. We have the power to unravel the Complex and destroy the Institutional Left. It won't be easy. It will take time and effort, and there will be false starts and roadblocks, but we'll do it, because we have to do it. Apathy in the face of determined Frankfurt School/Alinsky/critical-theory-trained activists is national suicide.

As one who loves to shine a light on the progressive left and become a rod for the truth and for conservatism, Breitbart wrapped it all up in a short, simple paragraph. We indeed have the power to unravel the Complex and destroy the Institutional Left. However, we also know that there will be times in which for every step we take forward, we take 4 steps back. Right now is NOT the time to give up and give in to the Left and even to those on our own side. We need to get out there and take the fight to them and push them back. If we do not, then it is just national suicide because the Frankfurt School/Alinsky/critical-theory-trained activists like the Occupy movement, like the Organizing for America group, like the Move On crowd, have had the upper hand for close to 3 or 4 decades now. Yes ladies and gentlemen, this change had not been done overnight but over time. Remember what Kurt Dillon said in the book *Escape to Freedom* by AJ Reissig:

A long time ago, one of the Soviet Leaders...and I can't remember which...said that Americans will never jump from capitalism to communism. However, if American leaders dished out small doses of socialism, then the American people would one day awaken to find they have communism. We didn't get here overnight, and if all of the socialist changes had taken place at once, the people would have had none of it. But a gradual change...most people didn't realize it was happening.

We are at that path as we speak, and even Alexander Tytler spoke of it about 250 years ago:

"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largess from the public treasury.

"From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising them the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, always followed by a dictatorship.

"The average age of the world's greatest civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through this sequence:

"From bondage to spiritual faith;
 from spiritual faith to great courage;
 from courage to liberty;
 from liberty to abundance;
 from abundance to selfishness;
 from selfishness to apathy;
 from apathy to dependence;
 from dependency back again into bondage."

Breitbart must have known and realized that we are on our way back to bondage, which is why he came up with the Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries as a way for us to destroy and dismantle the Media Complex and the

Progressive Left, as well as the kooks on our own side. All we have to do is not be afraid and to go out there, putting our knowledge of the Primer to good use.



I am an Andrew Breitbart Conservative

(Written June 8, 2013)

A while back on Facebook I had read somewhere that a couple of people call themselves Frederick Douglass Republicans. Well I would like to toss another term into the mix: Andrew Breitbart Conservative.

Over the past 13 weeks I had been going through the Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries during these editorials, and in my research on the topics, I realize that I am an Andrew Breitbart Conservative. When I began introducing the Pragmatic Primer, I mentioned that this battle is not Left v. Right, Liberal v. Conservative, or even Democrat v. Republican. This battle is one step DEEPER than that: Alinsky v. Breitbart. The seeds for the major part of this battle were laid when Andrew gave his wonderful speech at the 2012 CPAC just a few weeks before his death.

During that speech he said that many are on to the “Saul Alinsky Bullshit ways” of the Progressive Left and that the 2012 election would be forever known as the “dogwhistle” election. We were right on the cusp of victory with Mitt Romney only to have it grabbed away from us at the last minute. It also showed down the ticket as we barely kept the House and failed to grab the Senate.

In order for us to win the Senate and increase our lead in the House in the 2014 midterms, we have to learn where we went wrong in the 2012 House and Senate elections. Then when we find out where we went wrong we have to learn to not repeat the same things if AND ONLY IF we are serious about winning in 2014 and carry that momentum into 2016. One of the main things that Andrew said, and I use it as my own motto ever since, is “Anyone that’s willing to stand next to me and fight the progressive left, I will be in that bunker, and if you’re not in that bunker, more than shame on you. You’re on the other side!”

After hearing that speech, I knew I was an Andrew Breitbart Conservative, but did not fully embrace it until after I got his book *Righteous Indignation* for Christmas and then went through the Pragmatic Primer. Now, after reading it many times and going over the Pragmatic Primer on my radio show, I fully embrace it because just like Andrew said at the end of the book on page 232 in the hardback edition:

“These are the years that we will look back on and question whether we did enough for our country and for our children. That’s why I’m so determined, so pissed, so righteously indignant. Excuse me while I save the world.”

CHAPTER 2

PART TWO: AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM

The second series I will be posting here is a section I had just done in July and August, 2013, on American Exceptionalism. For this I have to thank Michael B. Martisko for as he and I had gotten into a very heated discussion on Facebook about President Barack Hussein Obama being a natural born citizen, we had gotten into a discussion on American Exceptionalism. Now for the record, I am a conservative Republican and do not like Obama, but there is no doubting the fact that he is a natural born citizen based on the fact that he was born in Hawaii. Even if he were not born in Hawaii, he would still be a natural born citizen on the basis that his mother was an American Citizen from Maryland who married a man from the British colony of Kenya, regardless of what some people say. However, that is another topic for possibly another book. Mike had said that because another person and I argued with him on Obama's birth, we had ruined his beliefs on what American Exceptionalism is, so I decided to do a series of editorials on American Exceptionalism as a part of my talk show.

American Exceptionalism

(Written July 13, 2013)

A couple of weeks ago I had said that someone had said that a friend and I just destroyed 60 years of “American Exceptionalism” for him. That got me to thinking, and in the Hillsdale College publication called *Imprimis*, there was an interesting article by Norman Podhoretz, former Editor-in-Chief of *Commentary Magazine*, entitled “Is America Exceptional?” Over the next few weeks I will be reading from it during this editorial. Here is the first part:

ONCE UPON A TIME, hardly anyone dissented from the idea that, for better or worse, the United States of America was different from all other nations. This is not surprising, since the attributes that made it different were vividly evident from the day of its birth. Let me say a few words about three of them in particular.

First of all, unlike all other nations past or present, this one accepted as a self-evident truth that all men are created equal. What this meant was that its Founders aimed to create a society in which, for the first time in the history of the world, the individual's fate would be determined not by who his father was, but by his own freely chosen pursuit of his own ambitions. In other words, America was to be something new under the sun: a society in which hereditary status and class distinctions would be erased, leaving individuals free to act and to be judged on their merits alone. There remained, of course, the two atavistic contradictions of slavery and the position of women; but so intolerable did these contradictions ultimately prove that they had to be resolved—even if, as in the case of the former, it took the bloodiest war the nation has ever fought.

Secondly, in all other countries membership or citizenship was a matter of birth, of blood, of lineage, of rootedness in the soil. Thus, foreigners who were admitted for one reason or another could never become full-fledged members of the society. But America was the incarnation of an idea, and therefore no such factors came into play. To become a full-fledged American, it was only necessary to pledge allegiance to the new Republic and to the principles for which it stood.

Thirdly, in all other nations, the rights, if any, enjoyed by their citizens were conferred by human agencies: kings and princes and occasionally parliaments. As such, these rights amounted to privileges that could be revoked at will by the same human agencies. In America, by contrast, the citizen's rights were declared from the beginning to have come from God and to be “inalienable”—that is, immune to legitimate revocation.

As time went on, other characteristics that were unique to America gradually manifested themselves. For instance, in the 20th century, social scientists began speculating as to why America was the only country in the developed world where socialism had failed to take root. As it happens, I myself first came upon the term “American exceptionalism” not in Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, where it has mistakenly been thought to have originated, but in a book by the sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset, who used it in connection with the absence in America of a strong socialist party. More recently I have discovered that the term may actually have originated with Joseph Stalin, of all people, who coined the term in the same connection but only in order to dismiss it. Thus, when an American Communist leader informed him that American workers had no intention of playing the role Marx had assigned to the worldwide proletariat as the vanguard of the coming socialist revolution, Stalin reputedly shouted something like, “Away with this heresy of American exceptionalism!” And yet Stalin and his followers were themselves exceptional in denying that America was exceptional in the plainly observable ways I have mentioned. If, however, almost everyone agreed that America was different, there was a great deal of disagreement over whether its exceptionalism made it into a force for good or a force for evil. This too went back to the beginning, when the denigrators outnumbered the enthusiasts.

Notice the three things that Podhoretz said which made America exceptional:

- 1.) A self-evident truth that all men are created equal.
- 2.) To become a full-fledged American, it was only necessary to pledge allegiance to the new Republic and to the principles for which it stood.
- 3.) In America, the citizen's rights were declared from the beginning to have come from God and to be “inalienable”—that is, immune to legitimate revocation.

Other characteristics had come about in the 20th century that also made America exceptional, but for the purposes of today's editorial I will focus on these three just briefly because these three have caused a lot of controversy today. Numbers 1 and 3 go together because we see them in the Declaration of Independence with the phrase "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that ALL MEN (i.e. humankind) are created equal, that they are endowed BY THEIR CREATOR WITH CERTAIN INALIENABLE RIGHTS, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." This proves that America was founded on a JUDEO-CHRISTIAN heritage. However, not many believe we were founded on a Judeo-Christian heritage, and I will be devoting an entire show to it. I will start with that if Jefferson were to see what people had done to the phrase "Separation of Church and State" today as opposed to when he wrote it in 1802, he would be livid.

The second cause of what made America exceptional deals with citizenship. Not only were we the first nation to say that if you pledge allegiance to the Republic and the principles for which it stood, then you are a citizen but I will go ONE STEP FURTHER and say that if you recite this when you are a child AND you are born here, irregardless of your parents' citizenship status, then you ARE A NATURAL BORN CITIZEN. Many people say that the ONLY time children are natural born is if their citizens are parents, and that is so far from the truth it is unreal. I can spend an entire show on this in the future, and I will, but today is not the day to do it.

Look for me to bring these three issues out in a later editorial and possibly show. America IS and ALWAYS HAS BEEN exceptional, and I aim to bring that out more on this show.

American Exceptionalism (Part 2)

(Written July 20, 2013)

Barack Obama says that there is no such thing as American Exceptionalism as much as there is British Exceptionalism or Greek Exceptionalism. Well there are many reasons to make America MORE exceptional, and I brought it out in last week's editorial. Now we will discuss just how people had lost sight of American Exceptionalism.

At first, anti-American passions were understandably fuelled by the dangerous political challenge posed to the monarchies of Europe by the republican ideas of the American Revolution. But the political side of anti-Americanism was soon joined to a cultural indictment that proved to have more staying power. Here is how the brilliant but volatile historian Henry Adams-the descendent of two American presidents-described the cultural indictment as it was framed in the earliest days of the Republic:

In the foreigner's range of observation, love of money was the most conspicuous and most common trait of the American character No foreigner of that day-neither poet, painter, or philosopher-could detect in American life anything higher than vulgarity Englishmen especially indulged in unbounded invective against the sordid character of American society Contemporary critics could see neither generosity, economy, honor, nor ideas of any kind in the American breast.

In his younger days, Adams defended America against these foreign critics; but in later life, snobbishly recoiling from the changes wrought by rapid industrialization following the Civil War, he would hurl the same charge at the America of the so-called Gilded Age.

We see a similar conflict in Tocqueville. Democracy in America was mainly a defense of the country's political system and many of its egalitarian habits and mores. But where its cultural and spiritual life was concerned, Tocqueville expressed much the same contempt as the critics cited by Henry Adams. The Americans, he wrote, with "their exclusively commercial habits," were so fixated "upon purely practical objects" that they neglected "the pursuit of science, literature, and the arts," and it was only their proximity to Europe that allowed them "to neglect these pursuits without lapsing into barbarism." Many years later, another Frenchman, Georges Clemenceau, went Tocqueville one better: "America," he quipped, "is the only nation in history which miraculously has gone from barbarism to decadence without the usual interval of civilization."

The main reason for the enduring power of the cultural critique was its fervent embrace, beginning in the late 19th century, by the vast majority of the writers, artists, and intellectuals who followed Tocqueville. And so it still goes in 2012, when the putative materialism and crassness of American life are harped upon in movies, television shows, novels, volumes of social criticism, and op-ed pieces too numerous to count.

Like Tocqueville and the foreigners cited by Henry Adams, moreover, these more recent works attribute this crassly philistine attitude to the love of money and "the exclusively commercial habits" that went with it-in other words, to the species of freedom that has done more than anything else ever invented to lift masses of people out of poverty and that would later be known as capitalism. America, these critics were declaring, was exceptional all right-exceptionally bad, or even downright evil.

We had seen the decline of American Exceptionalism in the late 19th century with the advent of the Gilded Era. This was also about the time that the government decided that they are best suited to teach out students and also when many had thought America was a democracy and not a Republic, but I will get to them in a later editorial. Today we see many not interested in politics (when it is all around us) or even sat that greed is bad and we need to share the wealth. That is NOT what American Exceptionalism is supposed to be about, and the more we fall down that path the worse off America will be.

American Exceptionalism (Part 3)

(Written July 27, 2013)

Last week we had explored what Alexis de Tocqueville and Henry Adams had said about American Exceptionalism. This week I will just ask a simple question: Compared to what is America so bad?

On the other hand, there have always been defenders of American exceptionalism as a vital force for good. Thus, several decades before switching sides, Henry Adams charged America's foreign critics with blindness to the country's amazing virtues. Whereas, Adams wrote, European philosophers and poets could see only rapacity and vulgarity here, the poorest European peasants could discern that "the hard, practical money-getting American democrat was in truth living in a world of dream" and was "already guiding Nature with a kinder and wiser hand than had ever yet been felt in human history." It was this dream, Adams went on to say, that beckoned to the poor of the old world, calling upon them to come and share in the limitless opportunities it offered-opportunities unimaginable anywhere else.

For a long time now, to speak personally, I have taken my stand with the young Adams, to whom America was exceptionally good, against his embittered older self, to whom it had become exceptionally bad. In my own younger days, I was on the Left, and from the utopian vantage point to which leftism invariably transports its adherents, it was the flaws in American society-the radical 1960s trinity of war, racism, and poverty-that stood out most vividly. It rarely occurred to me or my fellow leftists to ask a simple question: Compared to what is America so bad?

From our modern perspective, much more was wrong with Periclean Athens, or the Italy of the Medicis, or England under the first Queen Elizabeth, or 19th-century Russia under the Romanovs. But this has not disqualified them from being universally ranked among the highest points of human civilization and achievement. After more than 40 years of pondering the question "Compared to what?" I have come to believe with all my heart that the United States belongs on that exalted list. It is true that we have not earned a place on it, as the others mainly did, by our contribution to the arts. Yet it is worth pointing out that even in the sphere of the arts, we have not done too badly. To speak only of literature, names like Walt Whitman, Mark Twain, Edith Wharton, Robert Frost, and many others attest that we have, in fact, done far better than might generally have been expected of a nation conceived primarily to achieve other ends. These ends were social, political, and economic, and it is in them that we have indeed excelled the most.

We have excelled by following our Founding Fathers in directing our energies, as our Constitution exhorts us to do, to the preservation of the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, as well as to the pursuit of happiness tacitly understood by the Declaration of Independence to require prosperity as a precondition. (In his original draft of the Declaration, of course, Jefferson used the word "property" instead of "pursuit of happiness.") By remaining faithful in principle-and to a considerable extent in practice-to the ideas by which the Founders hoped to accomplish these ends, we and our forebears have fashioned a country in which more liberty and more prosperity are more widely shared than among any other people in human history. Yes, even today that holds true, despite policies unfaithful both to the letter and to the spirit of the traditional American system that have resulted in a series of political and economic setbacks.

The question Podhoretz asked (Compared to what is America so bad?) is one we should be asking all of our liberal friends. See if this will get them to think and find out just WHY they think America is so bad. This will force them to do what Andrew Breitbart had said in *Righteous Indignation* when he brought up his *Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Revolutionaries*. If you remember, Rule 9 of the *Primer* dealt with not letting them pretend to know more than they do. In fact, let me read just a small excerpt from it when I did my editorial on that particular rule.

"Your opponents will pretend to be experts if you don't, but that's okay, because you can always puncture their balloon with one word: why. Asking them to provide evidence for their assertions is always fun, and it's even more fun asking them to provide the sources for that evidence. Attacking the fundamental basis of their arguments is fun, too - if they tell you health care is a right, ask why. Liberals don't have a why, other than their own utopianism and

their dyspeptic view of the status quo and America. Reason is not their strong suit - emotion is. Force them to play on the football field of reason.”

As Andrew said, there is one word which we can use to puncture the false narrative propagated by the left, and even a few kooks on our own side. That word is why, a simple three-letter word with a lot of power and oomph behind it. If we ask why they think that, then they will have to come up with a reason. As we all know, reason is not their strong suit because they always rely on emotion.

As I had said at the end of that particular editorial, “We have the tools to force our opponents to play on the football field of reason. The thing of it is do we have the WILLPOWER to confront them and force them to play on that football field of reason, or are we afraid to do it?”

American Exceptionalism (Part 4)

(Written August 3, 2013)

So far as liberty is concerned, until recently no one but libertarians have been arguing that we were insufficiently free in the United States. If anything, some conservatives, dismayed by such phenomena as the spread of pornography and sexual license, thought that we had too much freedom for our own good. But thanks to modern liberalism's barely concealed hostility to the free market, not to mention the threat posed by Obamacare to religious and economic freedom, many conservatives are now echoing these libertarian arguments, if in a milder form.

Judging by what they say and the policies they pursue, modern liberals are not all that concerned about liberty. What they really care about, and what they assign a higher value to, is economic equality (as reflected in the now famous phrase, "spread the wealth around"). Yet here is what the late Daniel Patrick Moynihan wrote in 1976 about this very issue in connection with the redistributionist ideology then regnant at the United Nations:

And equality ... what is the record? The record was stated most succinctly by an Israeli socialist who told William F. Buckley, Jr. that those nations which have put liberty ahead of equality have ended up doing better by equality than those with the reverse priority This is our case. We are of the liberty party, and it might surprise us what energies might be released were we to unfurl those banners.

Four years later, Ronald Reagan came along to unfurl those banners. And just as Moynihan predicted, the result was the release of new political and economic energies that reversed the political and economic decline of the Carter years and that led to our victory in the Cold War.

Of course, the party of liberty Moynihan was talking about was the United States of America and the party of economic equality was the socialist countries of what was then called the Third World. But within America today, an analogous split has opened up, with the Republicans constituting the party of liberty and the Democrats more and more becoming the party of redistribution. Hence the Democrats never stop claiming that the rich are failing to pay their fair share of taxes. Yet after surveying the numbers, the economist Walter Williams of George Mason University asks an excellent question: "What standard of fairness dictates that the top ten percent of income earners pay 71 percent of the federal income tax burden while 47 percent of Americans pay absolutely nothing?" To which an editorial in the Wall Street Journal replies: "There is nothing fair about confiscatory tax policy that reduces growth, denies opportunity, and keeps more people in poverty."

Normally I would not agree or endorse anything a Democrat says, but I think Moynihan hits the proverbial nail on the head with this statement in regards to American Exceptionalism. Read that one part once more:

The record was stated most succinctly by an Israeli socialist who told William F. Buckley, Jr. that those nations which have put liberty ahead of equality have ended up doing better by equality than those with the reverse priority (emphasis mine)

Even Moynihan, who was a sociologist, recognized the need of putting liberty ahead of equality. In doing so, the nation had ended up doing better by equality than those who put equality ahead of liberty. Today under Obama, and I will go so far as to say under the other two Democrats (Carter and Clinton) as well, America is putting equality ahead of liberty, and as such we are failing. There had been a couple of times (from 1981 - 1989 under Ronald Reagan and also in George W. Bush's first term from 2001 - 2005) in which America was successful because we put liberty ahead of equality, but that is only 12 years in the past 36 years. All the other times (and granted I did vote for George W. Bush for reelection in 2004) the presidents put equality ahead of liberty, and this is the mess we are in now.

This also leads to the Tytler Cycle that I had mentioned many times in the past.

"A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover they can vote themselves largess from the public treasury.

"From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidates promising them the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy, always followed by a dictatorship.

“The average age of the world’s greatest civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed through this sequence:

“From bondage to spiritual faith;
from spiritual faith to great courage;
from courage to liberty;
from liberty to abundance;
from abundance to selfishness;
from selfishness to apathy;
from apathy to dependence;
from dependency back again into bondage.”

There had been a few times in which both Reagan and Bush 43 have kept or put us back into the courage to liberty stage, but more often than not the presidents had moved us into the selfishness to apathy or even apathy to dependency stage, with Obama doing his damndest to put us in to the dependency to bondage stage. The reason he has not is because of we the people and how WE maintain those traits which make America great and exceptional.

American Exceptionalism (Part 5)

(Written August 10, 2013)

Last week we talked about the differences between a nation which put liberty ahead of equality, and those who put equality ahead of liberty. This week we will discuss more from de Tocqueville and what he had said on the differences between Americans and Europeans as well as the gap between rich and poor

Then too there is the assumption, blithely accepted by the party of economic equality, that the gap between rich and poor-or even between the rich and the middle class-self-evidently amounts to a violation of social justice. Yet far from being self-evident, this assumption stems from a highly questionable concept of social justice-one that rules out or minimizes the role played by talent, character, ambition, initiative, daring, work, and spirit in producing unequal outcomes in “the pursuit of happiness.”

Furthermore, both the assumption and its correlative concept of social justice run counter to the American grain. As study after study has shown, and as the petering out of the Occupy Wall Street movement has recently confirmed, what Tocqueville observed on this point in the 1830s remains true today: Americans, unlike Europeans, he wrote, “do not hate the higher classes of society” even if “they are not favorably inclined toward them” Which is to say that most Americans are not prone to the envy of the rich that eats away at their self-appointed spokesmen on the Left.

Nor are most Americans subject to the accompanying passion for economic egalitarianism that made for the spread of socialism in other countries. What explains the absence of that levelling passion is that it has been starved by the opportunities America has afforded millions upon millions to better their lot and the advantage they have been free to take of those opportunities-which in turn explains how unprecedented and unmatched levels of prosperity have been created here and how they have come to be shared more widely here than anywhere else.

Tocqueville also put his finger on a second and related reason for the persistence of this particular feature of American exceptionalism: “The word poor is used here in a relative, not an absolute sense. Poor men in America would often appear rich in comparison with the poor of Europe.” A story I was once told by a Soviet dissident provides an amusing illustration. It seems that the Soviet authorities used to encourage the repeated screening of *The Grapes of Wrath*, a movie about the Great Depression-era migration of starving farmers from the Dust Bowl to California in their broken-down pickups. But contrary to expectation, what Soviet audiences got from this film was not an impression of how wretched was the plight of the poor in America. Instead they came away marvelling that in America, “even the peasants own trucks.”

Tocqueville further observed that in America, “the poor, instead of forming the immense majority of the nation, as is always the case in aristocratic communities, are comparatively few in number, and the laws do not bind them together by the ties of irremediable and hereditary penury.”

One thing I had found interesting is what de Tocqueville observed in America, as he wrote in the last paragraph, that the poor are “comparatively few in number, and the laws don’t bind them together by the ties of irremediable and hereditary penury.” Looking at America of the 21st Century you would have considered de Tocqueville crazy for writing that, but if you look at some of the plantations in the South, as well as some of the homes in the North, during the times before the Civil War you would think different. Actually, it was AFTER the Civil War (or the War Between the States, the war of Southern Independence, whatever you want to call it) where you see the lack of the nouveau riche and the sophistication that was popular before 1861. Keep in mind the South was in a total state of disarray and their main lifestyle was almost obliterated. The South had to rebuild somehow during reconstruction, but the economy had undergone a change in the south, and as such the poor (not only in the south but in the north as well) began to form the immense majority of the nation.

And if you look around the world, this is what Socialism and socialistic policies bring about as well. I am thinking Podhoretz is warning against this in the article, and if we fail to heed his words, then we will wind up like what we had read and seen in *Atlas Shrugged*.

American Exceptionalism (Part 6)

(Written August 17, 2013)

Last week I expanded on the notion that the poor are “comparatively few in number, and the laws don’t bind them together by the ties of irremediable and hereditary penury.” This week I will continue on that and then speak about the U.S in world affairs

As the great economist and social critic Thomas Sowell has demonstrated time and again, it is still the case that the poor in America “are comparatively few in number.” And except for the black underclass-whose size is generally estimated at somewhere between two and ten percent of the black community and whose plight has thus far resisted every attempt at alleviation over the past 50 years-it is also true that penury in the United States is neither irremediable nor hereditary. As Sowell shows, of those who live on the next rung of the economic ladder, more of whom are white than black, only three percent get stuck in the bottom fifth of the income distribution for more than eight years.

Elaborating on Sowell’s analyses, the economist Mark Perry writes:

In the discussions on income inequality and wage stagnation, we frequently hear about the “top 1%” or the “top 10%” or the “bottom 99%” and the public has started to believe that those groups operate like closed private clubs that contain the exact same people or households every year. But the empirical evidence ... tells a much different story of dynamic change in the labor market-people and households move up and down the earnings quintiles throughout their careers and lives. Many of today’s low-income households will rise to become tomorrow’s high-income households, and some will even eventually be in the “top 10%” or “top 1%.” And many of today’s “top 1%” or top income quintile members are tomorrow’s middle or lower class households, reflecting the significant upward and downward mobility in the dynamic U.S. labor market.

No such mobility can be found in any of the member countries of the European Union, or anywhere else for that matter. Even in the dismal economic state our nation has fallen into today, it is still exceptional where the degree and the distribution of prosperity are concerned. But to this, modern liberals are willfully blind.

With all exceptions duly noted, I think it is fair to say that what liberals mainly see when they look at America today is injustice and oppression crying out for redress. By sharp contrast, conservatives see a complex of traditions and institutions built upon the principles that animated the American Revolution and that have made it possible-to say yet again what cannot be said too often-for more freedom and more prosperity to be enjoyed by more of its citizens than in any other society in human history. It follows that what liberals-who concentrate their attention on the relatively little that is wrong with America instead of the enormous good embodied within it-seek to change or discard is precisely what conservatives are dedicated to preserving, reinvigorating, and defending.

A similar divide separates liberals and conservatives as to the role America has played in world affairs. Consider the many apologies President Obama has issued for the misdeeds of which he imagines Americans have been guilty in our relations with other countries in general and the Muslim world in particular. Never mind that the United States has spilled blood and treasure to liberate and protect many millions of people from the totalitarian horrors first of Nazism and then of Communism, and that since 9/11 we have spilled yet more blood and treasure fighting against Islamofascism, the totalitarian successor to Nazism. And as to the Muslim world in particular, never mind that, as the columnist Mona Charen puts it, “of the last six wars in which the United States was involved (Kuwait, Bosnia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, Iraq and Libya), four were undertaken to rescue Muslims and the other two (Afghanistan and Iraq) had the side benefit of liberating Muslims -to what end remains an open question.”

Over the past 80 years or so, we had to deal with Nazism, Communism, and now Islamofascism trying to take over the world, though we had dealt with Islamofascism in one form or another since the 1780’s. We had always been the world’s savior, so to speak, with Nazism and Communism, and for the past 12 years some people had put the blame on us for the rapid rise of Islamofascism since the attacks on September 11, 2001. With everything that is happening in Europe with the expansion of Sharia Law, I think we are ultimately the last stand in the world in preventing it, no

matter how hard Obama is trying to change that with his apology tour and whatnot. If we want to keep America exceptional as WE know it, we need to continue to be the shining light for hope and capitalism in the world.



American Exceptionalism (Part 7)

(Written August 24, 2013)

Podhoretz wraps up his speech on American Exceptionalism with a very exceptional challenge to us

In spite of all this, the liberal community seems to think that the rest of the world would be better off without the United States, or at least with it following the policy of “leading from behind.” Admittedly there are paleoconservatives like Pat Buchanan and libertarians like Ron Paul who agree on this point, but most conservatives do not believe that a radical diminution of American power and influence would be good for us or for the world.

Shortly before the election of 2008, then-candidate Obama declared that his election would usher in “a fundamental transformation of America.” The desirability of such a transformation-which would entail the wiping away of as many more traces of American exceptionalism as it will take to turn this country into a facsimile of the social-democratic regimes of western Europe-is the issue at the heart of our politics today. And in the long run, I hope and trust, Americans will reject such a transformation, and elect instead to return to the principles that have made this nation so exceptional-yes, exceptional-a force for good both at home and abroad.

As we had seen in the 2008 election, and again in the 2012 election, Obama is all about the fundamental transformation of America and rooting out those things which made America exceptional. As Norman Podhoretz wrote this in October, he was no doubt warning us not to vote for Obama during the November elections, but the dumbass, dumb masses (as Neal Boortz calls the low-information or no-information voters who do not give a rip about politics) decided to vote Obama for a second term because they wanted their “FREE STUFF” and if Romney were elected, then he would cut that out. We have one more chance in 2014 to elect those who will look after the will of WE THE PEOPLE and not WE THE MOOCHER. Otherwise we will be heading back into slavery (the last step in the Tytler Circle) and we will be living in the same conditions we have seen in Atlas Shrugged and during the Great Depression.

If you want to go back and read the article as a whole, you can find it on the Imprimis Archive site. Just look for the October 2012 issue. I might read more Imprimis articles as an editorial series in the future. For now, I will end with this. What will YOU do to keep America exceptionalism foremost? What will YOU do to make America the greatest country on earth?

What Makes a True American?

(Written August 31, 2013)

Over the past 7 weeks on this very show you had heard me go through the article in Imprimis, which is put out by Hillsdale College, from October 2012 entitled "Is America Exceptional?" by Norman Podhoretz. This led me to wondering just what a TRUE AMERICAN really is. My good friend Alan D. Vera had posted the following on Facebook and after reading it, I know just what a TRUE AMERICAN is.

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

It never occurred to you to be offended by the phrase, 'One nation, under God.'

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

You've never protested about seeing the 10 Commandments posted in public places.

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

You still say 'Christmas' instead of 'Winter Festival.'

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

You bow your head when someone prays.

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

You stand and place your hand over your heart when they play the National Anthem.

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

You treat Viet Nam vets with great respect, and always have.

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

You've never burned an American flag.

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

You know what you believe and you aren't afraid to say so, no matter who is listening.

You might be a TRUE AMERICAN if:

You respect your elders and expect your kids to do the same.

God Bless the U S A ! Amen

AND YOU ARE A TRUE AMERICAN, IF YOU THINK THE NATIONAL ANTHEM SHOULD ONLY BE SUNG

As some of you know, when I started this show I started out with Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue by Toby Keith as it is COURTESY of the Red, White, and Blue that I was able to host this very show, which I took the title from if you think on it.

After Barack Obama stole the election on November 6, I got to thinking of a new theme song for the show, and as you heard at the top I had found a good one in Real American by Rick Derringer. Just listen to the chorus:

I am a real American

fight for the rights of every man

I am a real American

fight for what's right

fight for your life

For those of you on Twitter who had seen the #RedRightBlue hashtag you might have seen me mention that it is time for #RedRightBlue on #OTNN - a REAL SHOW for REAL AMERICANS. Well it is true. Just like what Alan said about true Americans, the same thing can be said for Real Americans.

CHAPTER 3

PART THREE: THE 2012 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

Here we are, one year into Barack Obama's second term. It is a term which should NOT have happened if people like Gary Johnson, Roseanne Barr (yes she actually was on a couple of ballots for President), and others had not have decided to run as a third party candidate. It was those third parties that destroyed the election for Mitt Romney and caused Obama to sneak ahead and win. Granted, there were some other factors which caused Romney to lose, but it is the third party looks which caused more of it. As Andrew Breitbart had so effectively said at CPAC in 2012: "If you're not in that bunker because you're not satisfied with that candidate, more than shame on you. You're on the other side."

On Red, Right, and Blue, I had gone through many editorials on how important the 2012 Presidential election was important to America and how we should defeat Barack Obama. This section is devoted to those editorials I had written on the 2012 election. In it I will also include two open letters (pre-convention and post convention) as well as my own eulogy on America.

The 2012 election and talk of a third party

(Written March 24, 2012)

This week in the Patriot Zone there was one person who had said that because it looks like Mitt Romney will be the Republican Presidential Nominee, he will be voting third party and encouraged others to do so as well. History has shown that third parties serve nothing but heartbreak for the sitting president. For a classic example of this, we need look no further than 1992 when George H. W. Bush, aka Bush 41, lost to Bill Clinton due to Ross Perot siphoning a large amount of votes. Outside of that, third party candidates (and there are many of them. I think on this ballot there are 40-50 third parties who would be fielding a presidential nominee.

In 2008, we had elected Barack Obama, one who was not properly vetted by the media and when he came in to office did so with the goal of fundamentally transforming our nation, ready to rule from day one according to Valerie Jarrett, a member of his then-transition staff. Now thanks to Andrew Breitbart and Sean Hannity, we have begun to properly vet Barack Obama. This election is WAY too important to waste it on a third party because of the destruction Obama has been doing. I feel that if we vote third party come November 6, 2012, we will in a sense be handing Obama the keys to the White House for another four years.

If we want to get Obama out of office in November, we have to do so with the right candidate. Outside of Perot's serious run in 1992, third party candidates have only served as spoilers for the sitting president in history. However, I feel that this year the third party candidate will serve to aid Obama in keeping the White House for another 4 years because of this current crop of candidates. Granted, I am a Republican and a Newt Gingrich supporter, but let's be realistic here. If he is not the nominee this year, the other three are not quite as electrifying to me as Newt is. It looks like Mitt Romney is the presumptive nominee, and if he keeps his position, I will vote for him in November because he, like the other Republican nominees this year, are better than Obama. The only one who electrified and excited me this election season was Herman Cain, but thanks to the establishment suits on both the Republican and the Democrat since he was forced to suspend his campaign.

My good friend and co-host Harriet Baldwin had posted a couple of things to really put this election into perspective when she posted the following two comments in The Patriot Zone.

Let me be clear: This is the MOST important election in our lifetimes. We MUST get behind the nominee-whomever it may be. A vote for ANY "third party candidate" is a vote for The Fraud aka Barack Hussein Obama. You are either with America or against America. Voting for Third Party or sitting on your sorry azz is unacceptable.

Get involved. Get informed. COMMUNICATE. This "Third Party" talk is FINE after 2012. Not now. Imagine what this America-hating Usurper will do as a Lame Duck? Give me a break. End of America.

The ONLY TRUE VIABLE alternative to Barack Hussein Obama in November is the Republican nominee, where it be Mitt Romney, the other three candidates running now, or whoever comes out of a brokered convention in August. Either way, whoever comes out of the Republican National Convention on August 30, we will have 60 days to coalesce around that candidate and do whatever it takes to defeat Obama. A vote for ANY of the third party candidates this year, and the clip from "Star Wars Episode 3: Revenge of the Sith" where Chancellor Palpatine said that the threat on his life by the Jedi has left him scarred and deformed, but his resolve has never been stronger and it because of that resolve that the Republic has been reorganized into the First Galactic Empire for a safe and secure society COULD VERY WELL be our future if Obama wins re-election.

I know I do not want this to happen. The question is, "Do You?"

The 2012 election and talk of a third party (Part 2)

(Written March 31, 2013)

Well apparently it seems like many people either did not read my entry from last week or they did and just brushed it off as nonsense so let me reiterate this once more.

THIS ELECTION IS WAY TOO IMPORTANT TO VOTE THIRD PARTY!

In other words, the ONLY TWO VIABLE CHOICES for this election are BARACK OBAMA AND THE REPUBLICAN NOMINEE. If you sit at home or vote for anyone else then it is a throwaway vote for Obama. Many of us have our own reasons why we are not going to vote for any of the GOP candidates in the primaries, but if this does not go into a brokered convention, then our ONLY OTHER CHOICE is to come together as a party or a group and vote Obama out. The only one that can do that is the Republican nominee. No third party candidate (outside of Ross Perot in 1992) had gotten enough traction to make a dent in the election count, whether it is popular vote or electoral vote.

Allow me to reiterate two comments made by me by Harriet Baldwin, my co-host, in the Patriot Zone

Let me be clear: This is the MOST important election in our lifetimes. We MUST get behind the nominee-whomever it may be. A vote for ANY "third party candidate" is a vote for The Fraud aka Barack Hussein Obama. You are either with America or against America. Voting for Third Party or sitting on your sorry azz is unacceptable.

Get involved. Get informed. COMMUNICATE. This "Third Party" talk is FINE after 2012. Not now. Imagine what this America-hating Usurper will do as a Lame Duck? Give me a break. End of America.

IF we do not vote for the GOP nominee in November, then the clip from Star Wars Episode 3: Revenge of the Sith that I mentioned last week will be our future during an Obama second term

If you want this to happen, then go ahead and vote for Barack Obama or those fronts known as third party candidates this year. I am voting for the Republican nominee because I want to be able to sing "Na Na Hey Hey Goodbye" by Steam come November 7.

The choice is yours, either a tyrannical anti-American dictator to lead us into the fall of the Republic, or the chance to sing Goodbye to him in November.

A vote for any but Romney is a vote for Obama

(Written June 23, 2012)

Apparently it seems like after I had presented a thought out argument on March 24, 2012 and continued it on March 31, 2012 where I spoke out AGAINST voting for a third party, it seems SOME PEOPLE still speak on voting third party even AFTER I had provided LOGICAL MATH AND HISTORY AGAINST IT! So let me reiterate one more time

THIS ELECTION IS WAY TOO IMPORTANT TO VOTE THIRD PARTY!

In other words, you are either ALL IN FOR OBAMA or you are ALL IN FOR ROMNEY! If you sit at home or vote for anyone else then it is a throwaway vote for Obama. I hear many of you say that is impossible but it is so true. We need look no further than 1992 when Ross Perot hindered the People from 4 more years of George H.W. Bush. Had Perot not have run, I feel Bush 41 would have won because most of the Perot votes were AGAINST Bush. This election the third party votes sway AGAINST Romney and are FOR Obama.

Don't believe me? Well try this out. Take two cups and label one Republican and one Democrat. Then take a third cup and label it Other (for Write-IN, No-Vote, or Third Party) and place it next to the other two. Now put 50 pennies in that cup for those who do not vote. Place 500 pennies in the other two cups. If you take even ONE PENNY from the Republican OR the Democrat cup right off the bat for a write-in or a third party vote, that cup has 499 while the other cup has 500. Therefore, you have one cup with more pennies. Therefore, you have in a sense removed one person's chances of winning. The only way for that person to have a chance of winning (or if the one cup wants to have more pennies) is if you take one of the 50 pennies from that third cup and put it in the cup that has 499.

To put it into a historical perspective, look at the map from 1992 for another example. Bill Clinton had 44,909,806 votes and George H.W. Bush had 39,104,550 votes. Now Ross Perot (the only viable third party candidate on the ballot as the others were crumb bums and shoe clerks) had 19,743,821 votes. With the close margin Clinton won over Bush (six million voters or so) those 20 million votes Perot siphoned away from Bush would have been enough to give Bush a second term. Also, it is interesting to note the Electoral Vote count. Clinton had 370 electoral votes to Bush's 168. If you look, Perot and the other third party candidates had NO ELECTORAL VOTES so they did not make much of an electoral difference but they did as far as the popular votes go.

If based on those two examples you still feel that a third party or a write in vote is the way to go, then you are voting for Obama. Allow me to posit these two quotes from former Red, Right, and Blue Co-Host Harriet Baldwin:

Let me be clear: This is the MOST important election in our lifetimes. We MUST get behind the nominee-whomever it may be. A vote for ANY "third party candidate" is a vote for The Fraud aka Barack Hussein Obama. You are either with America or against America. Voting for Third Party or sitting on your sorry azz is unacceptable.

Get involved. Get informed. COMMUNICATE. This "Third Party" talk is FINE after 2012. Not now. Imagine what this America-hating Usurper will do as a Lame Duck? Give me a break. End of America.

IF we do not vote for Mitt Romney in November, then the scene from Star Wars Episode Three where Palpatine reorganized the Republic into the First Galactic Empire WILL be our future during an Obama second term

I do not know about you, but the opening lyrics to the song "No Room in the Middle" by Greg X. Volz sum up the 2012 presidential election:

This election, there's no room in the middle, no room on the fence. There's no room in the middle it doesn't make sense. You are either all in for Obama or all in for Romney, and as Andrew Breitbart had said at CPAC back in February, "If you're not in that bunker because you're not satisfied with that candidate (in this case Romney), more than shame on you. You're on the other side."

Ladies and gentlemen, we need to save America, and the only one to do it is Romney. Any other vote this election is a vote for Obama which is the same thing as a vote against America. As the last clip shows, are you with us Patriots and REAL AMERICANS or are you on the other side? Those of you who are fence-sitters, those of you who are just

toeing the line until you see who will come out of the convention, have to make your choice RIGHT NOW! Romney has the delegates needed so he IS the nominee. If you are not for Romney then you are for Obama.



An open letter to ALL Registered Republicans

(Written August 11, 2012)

Dear all Registered Republicans,

Here we sit at 85 days from the November 6 General Election (as well as 16 days away from the start of the Republican Convention) and yet here we are still griping and complaining over something which we absolutely, positively CANNOT change. Instead of whining that our “preferred candidate” (whether it be Herman Cain or Newt or Santorum or even Ron Paul) is not the nominee we CAN get behind Mitt Romney (who IS the nominee) and do whatever it takes to get Barack Obama out of the White House in November.

For all intents and purposes, the primaries were over with back in April when Romney got out to that early lead, which meant that he was able to coast all the way through until the last Tuesday in May, when the primary in Texas put him over the top of the 1144 delegates needed for the nomination. It was also in April when he focused primarily on where the target of all of our disdain and degradation SHOULD be, that being on Barack Obama’s failed policies and no positive record. It SHOULD have been back in April when we all needed to coalesce behind Romney and focus on Obama. Instead, we have been spending the past 4 months griping about how “fixed” the primaries had been and also about how “unelectable” Romney is. That is NOT a way to take America back in November. Rather, that is a way of taking your ball and going home just because you are not willing to play by the rules and want things YOUR way!

Now I admit I am also upset that my candidate (first Herman Cain and then when he was forced out on December 3, 2011, due to some false accusations by some women who I like to term as “one-hit wonders” because they were ONLY out to harm his successful campaign, Newt Gingrich) is not the nominee. HOWEVER, I am not one to complain about it because it does nothing but derail me from my overall purpose of ensuring that Obama is defeated in November. Let us put our differences about who is the best candidate to defeat Obama in November and actually get behind the one who the PEOPLE chose OVERWHELMINGLY to go up against Obama.

We would do well to heed these wise words from great historical figures:

A house divided against itself cannot stand - Abraham Lincoln (spoken in 1858 at the acceptance of the Republican nomination for the United States Senate, quoting the Bible)

Any kingdom divided against itself is laid waste and any city or house divided against itself shall not stand - Jesus Christ (found in the Bible in Matthew 12:25, which Abraham Lincoln quoted above)

We must, indeed, all hang together, or assuredly we shall all hang separately. - Benjamin Franklin (said at the signing of the Declaration of Independence)

IF we do not get behind Mitt Romney between now and the Convention, then we might as well kiss this country goodbye because we are playing RIGHT INTO Obama’s hands. He is sitting up there in 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue (commonly called the PEOPLE’S White House but now is Communism Central) just rubbing his hands as America burns. And why is America burning? Because WE THE PEOPLE are fighting amongst ourselves instead of taking the fight to Obama and the Democrats WHERE IT TRULY BELONGS. We are also letting Obama dictate what should be talked about (the social issues, the tax records, all the things which my good friend Titan92 of Own The Narrative considers “shiny objects”) and not what are TRULY IMPORTANT. (the 8.3% REPORTED unemployment rate, the 15% REAL unemployment rate the 40+ months of unemployment over 8%, the millions of people leaving the workforce, the \$16T of debt, the fact that the Democrats in Congress have not passed a budget in almost 1300 days)

If you TRULY want to save America, then you will get behind Mitt Romney no matter what your principles or beliefs are and get Obama OUT of office. Otherwise, as Andrew Breitbart had said back at CPAC in February of this year, “if you’re not in that bunker ‘cause you’re not satisfied with this candidate, more than shame on you. You’re on the other side.”

I said it before, and I will say it again: “IF we do not vote for Mitt Romney in November, then the clip from Star Wars Episode Three where Palpatine turned the Republic into the First Galactic Empire WILL be our future during an Obama second term”

As was mentioned by Joshua after the initial conquest of Canaan (found in the biblical book of Joshua 24:15) “[And] if it disagreeable in your sight to serve the LORD, choose for yourselves today who you will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served which were beyond the River; or the gods of the Amorites in whose land you are living; but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD.” That verse is also applicable today. If it is disagreeable in your sight to vote for Mitt Romney, choose for yourselves today who you will vote for; whether Obama who has led America into the hell it is in; or the other minor candidates who will only serve as a front for Obama this year; but as for me and Conservative Nation Radio, we will vote for Romney.

Paul Ryan is a perfect pick for Mitt Romney

(Written August 18, 2012)

I would like to start this editorial by playing this video from Afterburner with Bill Whittle entitled “A Great Way to Win and Lose”:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3778luxnpI0&feature=player_embedded - Afterburner with Bill Whittle: A Great Way to Win and Lose

Whittle hit it on the head. Mitt Romney had made the PERFECT decision in selecting Paul Ryan as his Vice Presidential pick. Paul Ryan is young and smart, two things which liberals do not like. This pick also scares liberals because this race will focus on the main issues of jobs and the economy and not the shiny objects. Also, as Ryan had said during one of his speeches, “We want this debate about Medicare. we NEED this debate about Medicare.” Ryan is exciting and has done what Obama and the Democrats had not done in 3 years: produce a budget. In picking Ryan, Romney has galvanized the Conservatives and made this race exciting. Now it is our turn to do what all we can do in order to make Obama a one-term president.

Election 2012: ALL 50 states are up for grabs

(Written August 25, 2012)

I have mentioned on Own The Narrative a few times, as well as on Facebook and Twitter, that based on Fast and Furious, ObamaCare, and Sandra Fluke that all 50 states are up for grabs. Oh sure there will be states (like California, Illinois, and New York) which will vote for Obama but the key is by HOW MUCH Obama will win by in those states. Many people have told me that Romney should write those states off as unwinnable but I feel that if he holds Obama to within a single digit margin in those states, then it will be a victory for him. The key will be whether it will be a moral victory if Romney gets the 270+ electoral votes (I say Romney will get 326 or 327, Titan92 of Own The Narrative says 316, and Hey_Sherm also of Own the Narrative says 320) or a pyrrhic victory should Obama somehow win a second term.

According to an article by Colorado University, which I will get into later in the show, all signs point to a Romney landslide with 320 electoral votes for Romney with 218 for Obama. Though the study mainly focuses on the Electoral College, the study also said that 52.9% of the popular vote will go to Romney as opposed to 47.1% for Obama. This just leads more credence to my theory about all 50 states being up for grabs, especially as in the article it says that Romney will win all the swing states Obama won in 2008.

Those signs which point to a Romney landslide focus mainly on Jobs and the Economy. There are no social conservatism issues mentioned in this study at all. The reason for that is because social conservatism loses elections, and we are definitely seeing that with the Todd Akin v. Claire McCaskill race in the Missouri Senate race. Akin had a 10 point lead until last Saturday when he mentioned the thing about "legitimate rape" and then it saw the polls shift to McCaskill leading by 10 points in the span of 3 days, leading to the Cook Report stating that Akin is unelectable and that the Missouri Senate seat will remain unwinnable to Republicans as long as Akin stays in the race.

Outside of the Missouri Senate seat, I am confident we will keep the House, take back the Senate AND win the White House with Romney. And with that in mind we have to all we can to make 2012 a Republican victory.

An open letter to ALL Americans (Post-Convention Speech)

Here we sit at 59 days until the election, exactly 2 months from today we will vote for the direction we want America to go. Now, many people are still pushing the third party bolshoi of either Gary Johnson or Ron Paul or others, but I have espoused the failures of a third party vote many MANY times since March, which you can read at my 33rd rant and my 34th rant as well as my 45th rant and also listen to at my show on the June 23rd edition of Red, Right, and Blue. Allow me to reiterate those rants and the entire show once more so those of you who insist that voting third party is the way to go:

THIS ELECTION IS WAY TOO IMPORTANT TO VOTE THIRD PARTY!

In other words, a vote for a third party, a write-in vote, or a no vote this year IS a vote for Obama. If you do not believe me, then you need look no further than 1992 where Ross Perot gave us 8 years of Bill Clinton. I say 8 years as we all know that Bob Dole would have lost to Clinton in 1996 because he did not energize the base. This year we saw a Republican Convention where 90% of the speakers had given us enough oomph and impetus to vote for Romney. Even Newt Gingrich, who was harshly criticized by Romney during the Primaries, had even praised Mitt Romney and going so far as to compare him to Ronald Reagan during his speech.

We have also heard speeches from many future stars of the Republican Party such as Susana Martinez, Nikki Haley, Luis Fortuño, and Marco Rubio. Be on the lookout for Fortuño and Rubio sometime in the future as they will be the next president. And yes, they ARE BOTH ELIGIBLE as they are natural-born citizens. I am also thinking Haley and Martinez could make a run for the Presidency as well. The bottom line is that the Republican Convention had shown that we have a good bench to support Romney.

Now on the Democrat side of Washington, we do not see that much of a bench from them, and we even see that they are the most divisive of all. We see that in who they have as speakers, and also in their removal of God and Israel from the platform, only to put it back in after being called out by not only Bret Baier of Fox News Channel but also by many others. And even then, there has been a battle over it.

With the comparison and the battle of Conservative vs. Liberal and Republican vs. Democrat, all a third party will do FOR THIS ELECTION will serve to continue the divisiveness and thus ensure another 4 years to Obama to destroy this nation. I do not want that, and I know in all of your hearts you do not want it either. As I mentioned in my rants, this election you are either ALL-IN for Romney or you are ALL-IN for Obama. And if you vote third party, write in a vote, or stay at home, then you are in fact by default voting for Obama and the destruction of this nation. As Andrew Breitbart said at CPAC back in February (which is my motto for this election), "If you are not in the bunker because you are dissatisfied with this candidate, more than shame on you. You are on the other side."

I said it before, and I will say it again: "IF we do not vote for Mitt Romney in November, then the transformation of America from a Republic into an Empire much like Palpatine reorganizing the Republic into the First Galactic Empire in Star Wars Episode 3 WILL be our future during an Obama second term"

I said it before, and I will say it again. As was mentioned by Joshua after the initial conquest of Canaan (found in the biblical book of Joshua 24:15) "[And] if it disagreeable in your sight to serve the LORD, choose for yourselves today who you will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served which were beyond the River; or the gods of the Amorites in whose land you are living; but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD." That verse is also applicable today. If it is disagreeable in your sight to vote for Mitt Romney, choose for yourselves today who you will vote for; whether Obama who has led America into the hell it is in; or the other minor candidates who will only serve as a front for Obama this year; but as for me and Conservative Nation Radio, we will vote for Romney.

The Tea Party and this particular presidential election

(Written September 29, 2012)

A couple of days on Facebook, my friend Guy R. Smith wrote a letter which really puts this election in perspective

This Particular Presidential Election for My Tea Party Compatriots

Do you know why I'm willing to vote for, as many people want to frame it, the lesser of two evils this November? Because the other real choice in this Presidential Pageant is truly evil to the core. The determining factor to me is this; I have no question of Mr. Romney's love and respect for our Country, our Culture and our Society. And I have no question of the Dalibama's hate and disdain for our Country, our Culture and our Society. Everything else only rates a far distant second in this particular Presidential Pageant.

The only way we are going to effect the kind of changes many Constitution loving and Libertarian leaning Americans espouse to is through the legislature not the President. We're making solid inroads in this endeavor in each election. My biggest disappointment in this election cycle so far is that We The People flushed \$100 million+ down the figurative toilet chasing this silly Presidential Pageant decoy that the political establishment distracts us with every four years. Can you imagine what we could have done if those dollars had been invested in the campaigns of 100 real conservative House and Senate candidates?

But we're just 3 or 4 years into learning how this game is really played and we're learning fast. We'll make major changes in the operation of the GOP over the next couple of years because we're learning how that part works too. And we'll equal or exceed the Congressional progress we made in 2010 in the elections of 2014. Again because we'll have this election cycle under our belts and we'll adjust, improvise and improve between now and 2014. We didn't get here in a couple of election cycles and we won't back to where we need to be a couple of election cycles either. But we'll get back there a lot quicker than they got us here.

And after doing real research into who Mr. Romney is and his actual record, not the distortions put out in the primaries by Gingrich, Santorum, Perry and the rest of the GOP establishment candidates recruited by the Party to block Mr. Romney, as well as the distortions of the Democrats, I believe he has the right stuff to be a good, if not great President.

That's why voting for the, as they put it, "lesser of two evils" in this particular election is not a choice, it's the only choice, period.

What Guy had said is oh so true indeed. This election, the ONLY choice is to get rid of Obama. And as I had been saying in the past, the only one who has the ONLY ROAD to do it is Mitt Romney. Otherwise, there might not be any more elections to where we can make a difference. Keep in mind how Hitler came into power in the late 1920's and early 1930's. He did it through manipulation and deceit. In 1990 I had said that Saddam Hussein was like Hitler when he invaded Kuwait and that if he were not stopped, he would invade Saudi Arabia and then the rest of the Arabian Peninsula and Northern Africa. Saddam in my mind was the military Hitler while right now Obama is the political Hitler, taking over the country using the political system for his gains. In 2008 he was elected on the promise of Hope and Change, and he is indeed doing that by changing America from a Capitalist society to a socialist one. If we do not stop him in November, then he will continue to fundamentally transform this country into a Socialist nation.

The battle for America the next month (#WAR and #ThisMeans#WAR)

(Written October 6, 2012)

In the Own Your Narrative at the Own The Narrative Network group yesterday, I came across this wonderful post by Bill LaRussa Jr. (aka Titan92 on Own The Narrative and @TonyKatzMane on Twitter):

OK, so quick thing (Alright, maybe not so quick - TWSS):

I was LITERALLY outraged when when I clicked on Drudge in the wee hrs of the morning to see that “Wow, only 114K jobs added in September. Maybe the Unemp rate even went up a tad to 8.2%.” Then the outrage started when the # reported was an impossible 7.8%. “How absolutely fucking convenient” I howled to Texas or Busted on a skype call. Not even 2 g-damn days after Obama gets publicly humiliated in front of 70M people at debate, now he can change the subject for the weekend (and likely any momentum) while his sycophants in the media trump up this fraudulent (Yes, I said it, FRAUDULENT) stat to shepherd the 10-20% Idiocracy portion of the voting public.

Now, y’all that know me well enuf know that I was one of the earliest supporters of Mitt Romney during the primary season (around Oct 2011). I stood my ground against all comers & made my arguments - and pissed the shit out of a # of fellow conservatives/libertarians too. But to me it was worth it. Why? Not to sound hokey, but I believed in this guy when most conservatives - and almost all activist ones - did not. I believed then & I believe even more now after Wed debate that Mitt Romney was meant for us as President at this moment in time. I’ll spare y’all the laundry list of reasons, but I still believe them. He’s even grown as candidate since the primaries.

(“Titan, will you get to the effing point already?” Okay, I will.) Having said all this, I had my biggest moment of doubt about Mitt’s chances of victory minutes before I clicked offline & finally went to catch some zzzz. My crisis-of-confidence moment now barely a month away from election day, when the rubber finally meets the road. Thinking (and texting to 2 political buddies) “You know, maybe this country really cant handle this whole self-governing experiment. These Chicago political M-fers on the other side will just win no matter how they can win, truth & evidence be damned. Screw it all. Blah blah blah blah blah.”

Then I read a story posted by one of my best amigas on the Internets, Karen Siegemund (who I hope I get to some day meet in the real world. Chat her up, she’s good people - even for a Blue Stater :)). My random response to the story - about Obama team taking a woman @ Paul Ryan town hall out of context with her question & Paul’s subsequent response (Yeah, imagine that!) was “#WAR, Karen.” In that moment I was snapped back to reality of what’s in front of us: 32 days to get this won & the way to combat these BS tactics by the Chicago Thuggery campaign is by channeling the Late Andrew Breitbart (God rest his soul.). Hell I have his damn pic as my freaking avatar. Give up? HELL NO. 32 days to go & everything we do to help turn out BH Obama should be with one Breitbart quote in mind: WAR! Concede no point to the other side. WAR! Don’t even refer to BS manipulated statistics like the reported unemp rate, but state that there are over 24 million people out of work & millions of others working shitty part-time jobs because they have to. WAR! Accuse Mitt Romney of lying during the debate, while your own spokes-lady Stephanie Cutter basically concedes Obama lied about the \$5T Romney tax cut. WAR!

You see the point. I’m snapped back into it. Hope everyone will be in the foxhole with me for 32 more days, because the tough part hasn’t even started yet.

#WAR

What Titan said is oh so very true. We are 31 days away from the election, and we have not even gotten through the toughest part yet. In the words of John Paul Jones, we “have not yet begun to fight!” This election is WAY TOO IMPORTANT to just give up now. We must continue to press ahead if we must endure.

Titan had used the famous quote #WAR in his speech. That is right ladies and gentlemen, if you are not behind Mitt Romney right now, Saturday October 6, then more than shame on you because you are on the other side. And to expand on Breitbart’s famous quote #WAR, I will go on to say that #ThisMeansWAR. So for all of you who are voting for Barack Obama or any of the irrelevant third party candidates who want a fight, you got more than that. You just got a #WAR! Yes that is right you liberals, you Occupy sycophants, you third party HACKS, my declaration to you is #ThisMeansWAR!



More on this Presidential Election

(Written October 20, 2012)

A vote for anyone BUT Romney this year IS a vote for Obama. IF you want Obama out of the office this year, then the only moral decision you have to make is to VOTE FOR ROMNEY. I had said this in many editorials on this very show (see editorials for October 6, September 29, September 8, August 11, June 23, March 31, and March 24 as well as the entire show for June 23) that a vote for a third party, a no vote, or a write-in vote IS a vote for Barack Obama and the destruction of America as we know it. As Andrew Breitbart had said at CPAC back in February of this year, “If you are not in favor of this candidate for whatever reason, more than shame on you. You’re on the other side!”

I said it before, and I will say it again: “IF we do not vote for Mitt Romney in November, then what took place in Star Wars Episode 3 when Palpatine turned the Republic into the Frist Galactic Empire for a safe and secure society WILL be our future during an Obama second term”

I said it before, and I will say it again. As was mentioned by Joshua after the initial conquest of Canaan (found in the biblical book of Joshua 24:15) “[And] if it disagreeable in your sight to serve the LORD, choose for yourselves today who you will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served which were beyond the River; or the gods of the Amorites in whose land you are living; but as for me and my house, we will serve the LORD.” That verse is also applicable today. If it is disagreeable in your sight to vote for Mitt Romney, choose for yourselves today who you will vote for; whether Obama who has led America into the hell it is in; or the other minor candidates who will only serve as a front for Obama this year; but as for me and Conservative Nation Radio, we will vote for Romney.

Even after the election, our work is not done

(Written November 3, 2012)

For many people, the only time they worry about politics is only from the week before to the year before Election Day. They feel that all they have to do is vote and that is it, but is it really? Is there more to politics than just voting? The answer is that politics is more than just a one phase operation. Sure voting is a part of it, but it is not the only thing. The other part is holding the politicians' feet to the fire. And one way to that is by checking out The People's Vote. Chuck Kirkpatrick and DariaAnne DiGiovanni are the two purveyors of the site which seeks to keep the elected politicians - whether it is national, state, or local - honest by giving the people a voice in bills and issues on the legislative docket. And with the current presidential election, the call to hold the politicians' feet to the fire is needed now more than ever. If Obama wins the White House for a second term and the Republicans win the Senate and keep the House, we need to keep the Republicans in line by telling them to not give in to anything Obama does which bypasses Congress. Conversely, if Romney wins the White House and the Republicans win the House and keep the Senate, then we need to keep the Republicans in line by telling them to hold Romney to many if not all of the promises he had made regarding the repeal of ObamaCare.

This election is VERY WELL the most important election of our lifetime in the fact that if Obama wins a second term, then America as we know it will cease to exist if we do not hold Congress' feet to the fire. In order for America to remain the best country in the world, both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue should be held accountable.

The death of America and who is to blame

(Written November 10, 2012)

Someone had posted the following quote on my wall a couple of days after the election on Tuesday, and it is oh so very true

IN MEMORIUM: The United States, 236, of America, died at 11:59 p.m., Tuesday, November 6, 2012. Born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, she was the daughter of George and Martha Washington. She has been a light, and inspiration, to the masses who have embraced her open arms, seeking freedom and liberty. She was a beacon of hope, to the oppressed of the world. She was non-denominational, but could be heard whispering, "In God We Trust." She was an artist that enjoyed painting picturesque mountains and flowing fields of grain, landscapes and wildlife of all kinds. She encouraged everyone who visited, to enjoy and engage in her favorite activities; gardening, sewing, quilting, planting flowers, and cooking her many ethnic dishes. In her younger years she was an avid explorer and pioneer. She is survived by countless children of all ages, devastated by her untimely passing. In addition to her parents, she was preceded in death by untold patriots and great armies that have protected her blessed name and dedicated spirit. Friends of Miss Liberty are asked to share her legacy and pray for her deliverance.

Now, as far as who to blame for Romney's loss Tuesday which evidently led to the death of America, I think we ought to lay the blame on the three groups that deserve it. (WARNING: graphic language ahead)

1.) The Occupy movement: Yes I know they are not around in as full of a force as they were this time last year, but they were the major lynchpin in the downfall of America.

2.) The third party HACKS: If it were not for the third party candidates like Virgil Goode, Roseanne Barr, Jill Stein and more importantly Gary FUCKING Johnson I think Mitt Romney would have won the election. Here in Florida, Romney is losing (as the count is still going on) by 64,185 votes. Had the third party candidates (who combined had 68,576 votes with Gary Johnson grabbing 44,418 votes) voted for Romney, then he would have won Florida outright. Hell, I think it would have ben the same in the other states as well.

3.) The voting electorate as a whole. In 2009 a video had first been floated about where people who had voted for Obama (who ranged in ages from 18 - 80) were asked simple, basic questions about who was in charge of our nation, who Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid were, and other questions about politics that a 5th fucking grader should know, and they had no motherfucking clue on ANY of them! Take a look at this video (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I3ZLj_q4xI is the link to the 10 minute video) and you will see what I mean.

I know there are others who deserve it as well, but these three groups I mentioned deserve the brunt of it and should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. When I say this, I do not mean prosecuted in an actual court but rather in the court of public opinion, where it rightfully belongs.

And while I am at it, can we all agree that TRENDS and OMENS are irrelevant? As I went to get the paper on Wednesday (and also walk into a tree with my fist in the process) I was thinking about the following trends and omens we had on our side this election:

1.) EVERY election held on November 6 since Abraham Lincoln was elected in 1860 had gone to the Republicans

2.) The last 3 Governors to be nominated to run v incumbent Presidents have won.

3.) The last 3 times incumbent Presidents have lost, they were defeated by a Governor.

4.) The University of Colorado prognostication

5.) The Redskin Rule (Where there is a high correlation between the outcome of the last Washington Redskins home football game prior to the U.S. Presidential Election and the outcome of the election: when the Redskins win, the incumbent party wins the electoral vote for the White House; when the Redskins lose, the non-incumbent party wins. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Redskins_Rule for more)

I know there are other trends and omens that I had also heard somewhere but do not know them right off the top of my head.

ALL of them got tossed out the window thanks to Obama and the joke of an election!

Herman Cain had said that stupid people are ruining America, and he is oh so correct. Stupid people ARE ruining America, and we have seen it come out in full force not only in the presidential election, but also in a few of the senate races as well.

The question now we have to consider is what we need to do about it. The answer will be posited on this show and in future editorials.

An Open Letter to the Haters

(Written January 19, 2013)

I have picked up a lot of haters in my 38 years of being vertical and walking the earth. However, over the past three years that I had decided to actively blog about politics (as opposed to passively blog now and then) they had come out of the woodwork. Many would think that because I am a Conservative that it would come from the Liberals, but that is not the case. Roughly 95% of the haters had come from those who call themselves Conservative. The following goes out to them on behalf of myself and a few close friends:

Dear haters and other douchenozzles,

It is because of you and your egotistical bullshit that we are 24 - 48 hours from the coronation of Barack Obama. While I understand we each had different candidates through the Primaries, when Romney had the nomination all locked up in April we should have put our differences aside and supported him as the candidate to go up against Obama in November. However, that was not the case as had been mentioned on my rant blog as well as this very show on several occasions. Thanks to you, the Left had controlled the narrative and that led to Obama winning the White House for 4 more years.

Many of you had said that “a vote for Romney is a vote for Obama because they both believe the same thing.” I had disproven that as well because we had all seen how Obama hates America in many ways, more recently with the executive orders he signed this past Wednesday tightening gun control. On the other hand, if you had heard Romney with an open mind then you would know that he loves America and would do all he could in order to make this the best country on the earth. But you would not see that through your rose-colored glasses. We lost the White House not because of WHO we ran or HOW we ran, but rather because we were not a solid unit. Now, because we were not a solid unit, you better be prepared to see all that the Founding Fathers fought, bled, and died for crumble and America as we know it go to hell in a handbag even faster. I told you this is exactly what would happen, but you were so bull-headed that you could not see an inch from your own face.

I know you had told me to go back to my blog because I know nothing. I also know that you had told a few conservative BlogTalk Radio show hosts to get off the air and you have bragged that you ran off a couple of others. Well, you had not run us off but rather we are bigger and better than ever before. In the immortal words of Katy Abram to Arlen Specter, you have awakened a sleeping giant. We WILL NOT be denied. You might have run us off of BlogTalk Radio but you have NOT silenced us. We own the narrative because it is not just a fancy saying or something that can be turned off like a light switch. Rather, it is a way of life, something that is in us every second of our lives, and we are determined to make your lives a living hell the only way we know how. You might think that you have silenced us, but instead you have made our drive to take back America that much more in the fore. We are bound and determined to own and control the narrative. Whatever narrative we do not have, we will do all we can to take the narrative away from the liberals and also you haters. You are no better than the liberals. In fact, and I speak for myself on this, you are ALL liberals in my eyes!

Sincerely,

Richard P. (Rick) Bulow

A REAL American fighting for what's right

I do not know about you, but the haters and douchenozzles had only given me more incentive to get to #WAR and ensure that I can do all I can to save this nation in 2014 and beyond. While the past is behind us, I will do all I can to learn from it and move ahead so as not to let the past repeat itself.

Obama's Second Inauguration and America's Future

(Written January 26, 2013)

Well, the unthinkable which we had failed to prevent on November 6, 2012, had officially happened this past Sunday. We have 4 more years of Barack Obama. I say officially on Sunday because according to the Constitution January 20 is the official day when the President and Vice President begin their term, with the public inauguration occurring on Monday, January 21. We already know what plans Obama has for the second term, and that which I had long feared might just occur in his second term, that in turning the Republic which the Founding Fathers had fought and died to create into an Empire like that of Soviet Russia a century ago or (even worse) like that which we had seen come about in Star Wars Episode III: The Revenge of the Sith. Granted, the latter is just a movie, but it is still powerful nevertheless.

If you had not seen that movie, there is a very interesting clip which has been removed on YouTube where Chancellor Palpatine was speaking to the Senate and spoke of the Jedi attack on him, thus leaving him scarred and deformed. However, he said his resolve had never been stronger and that "in order to ensure our security and continuing stability, the Republic will be reorganized into the First Galactic Empire...for a safe and secure society!" The reply from Senator Padme Amidala is rather alarming, and possibly serves as a warning for us today: "So this is how liberty dies...with thunderous applause." Is there any way to prevent this from happening in our world today?

Fortunately, there might be a way. AJ Reissig has written a book entitled *Escape to Freedom: Book One in the FreedomRedux Series*. AJ lives in New Richmond, Ohio with his lovely wife Christina and children. Born in 1973, he grew up in the small river town of Moscow, Ohio. He is a graduate of the University of Cincinnati with a background in chemistry. After spending several years as an analyst in manufacturing, he began to pursue writing as a part-time freelancer. His hobbies include gardening, woodworking, home improvement, and anything outdoors.

AJ has long followed politics. Over the years, AJ has become increasingly disturbed by the trend toward big government in the United States. His novel series, *FreedomRedux*, revolves around a United States of the future that is governed by a totalitarian regime that is bent on world domination, and those who wish to restore the United States to the nation that the founding fathers intended. In 2011, he started the political blog *FreedomRedux* to express his libertarian political beliefs. In 2012, he founded *Freedom Notes Press, LLC* to publish political novels.

CHAPTER 4

PART FOUR: VARIOUS EDITORIALS

This section deals with any other editorials that I had written which do not fall under any specific topic. They are just various things I had read or heard which caused me to go off on a massive major rant on my blog and then mentioned on Red, Right, and Blue.

Time to give up, or time to fight on?

(Written January 5, 2013)

Last night the House voted to pass the Fiscal Cliff deal, thereby slapping the American People in the face. In fact, Speaker John Boehner (Republican from Ohio's 8th Congressional District) voted for the deal (thereby proving that he deserved the title of Schmuck of the Week on Red, Right, and Blue for December 8, 2012) as well as Budget Chairman Paul Ryan (Republican from Wisconsin's 1st Congressional District) while House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (Republican from Virginia's 7th congressional district) and House Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy (Republican from California's 22nd congressional district) voted against the deal, thereby dividing the House Leadership and also possibly firing Boehner as Speaker.

This whole fiscal cliff debacle reminds me of the most recent issue of the Imprimis newsletter from Hillsdale College. In it Dr. Larry Arnn, President of Hillsdale, had posted his interview on the Hugh Hewitt show from November 7. There was a very interesting dialogue at the beginning of the newsletter in which Hewitt had mentioned that "there are a lot of people who are close to saying "game over," who are tempted now to retreat from politics - to go do missionary work, for instance - and give up on the republic. But you have made your life's work the studying of leaders who have refused to do that." Dr. Arnn's answer is one in which many people should read many times and commit it to memory.

That's right. And the reason you can't do that, by the way - the reason you can't retreat into private life and give up on politics - is that the cost of doing it is overwhelming. If you don't live under good laws, life becomes truncated and less happy, injustice becomes customary, civilization is compromised. And one cannot acquiesce in that. One has to be involved. And since politics is natural to us - man is essentially political, as Aristotle says - and since we do live in the greatest modern country - founded that way at least - we owe it a lot. And many of the people who have seen the republic through to where we are today have gone through things that are worse than this. So first of all, it's a duty not to give up. But second, there are good reasons to know that the game isn't over.

When pressed by Hugh what he meant, Dr. Arnn went on to say,

One of them is that the election is shot through with contradictions. The obvious contradiction is that we have a divided government. The presidency and the Senate are in the hands of one party, and the House of Representatives and most governorships are in the hands of the other. A second contradiction is that a large majority of people continued to say in the exit polls that they were against raising taxes in order to cut the deficit.

One might be cynical and put that down to an irresponsible refusal to pay for existing benefits-to get more and more "free stuff." But for a long time now, opinion polls have pointed towards the existence of a broad majority of Americans who favor smaller government. This obviously contradicts the re-election of the president and the Democratic gains in the Senate. The country is still a house divided against itself, and that's dangerous. But it doesn't mean that there's been a resolution. It means in fact the opposite: there is not a resolution. That resolution still has to be made, and the making of it lies ahead of us, and not behind us.

Dr. Arnn went on to say that Reagan and Churchill were "two statesmen that regarded the Soviet Union as weak, even at the height of its power, because it was built on self-contradictory propositions and its system led to obvious and repeated injustices."

You can read the entire interview at http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/file/archives/pdf/2012_12_Imprimis.pdf and also subscribe to Imprimis for free at <http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/subscriber/new>. I strongly recommend subscribing to Imprimis as it brings the best and brightest from well-known politicians, columnists, and radio hosts like Thomas Sowell, Mark Steyn, John Bolton, Margaret Thatcher, Mark Helderin, and others. The main question here is, "will you give up, or will you fight on?"

Time to give up, or time to fight on (Part 2)

(Written on June 29, 2013)

In my editorial on January 5, I read from the December 2012 issue of *Imprimis* where Hugh Hewitt had an interview with the president of Hillsdale College Larry P. Arnn. Here is just a short sampling of that editorial:

There was a very interesting dialogue at the beginning of the newsletter in which Hewitt had mentioned that “there are a lot of people who are close to saying “game over,” who are tempted now to retreat from politics-to go do missionary work, for instance-and give up on the republic. But you have made your life’s work the studying of leaders who have refused to do that.” Dr. Arnn’s answer is one in which many people should read many times and commit it to memory.

That’s right. And the reason you can’t do that, by the way-the reason you can’t retreat into private life and give up on politics - is that the cost of doing it is overwhelming. If you don’t live under good laws, life becomes truncated and less happy, injustice becomes customary, civilization is compromised. And one cannot acquiesce in that. One has to be involved. And since politics is natural to us - man is essentially political, as Aristotle says - and since we do live in the greatest modern country - founded that way at least - we owe it a lot. And many of the people who have seen the republic through to where we are today have gone through things that are worse than this. So first of all, it’s a duty not to give up. But second, there are good reasons to know that the game isn’t over.

When pressed by Hugh what he meant, Dr. Arnn went on to say,

One of them is that the election is shot through with contradictions. The obvious contradiction is that we have a divided government. The presidency and the Senate are in the hands of one party, and the House of Representatives and most governorships are in the hands of the other. A second contradiction is that a large majority of people continued to say in the exit polls that they were against raising taxes in order to cut the deficit.

One might be cynical and put that down to an irresponsible refusal to pay for existing benefits-to get more and more “free stuff.” But for a long time now, opinion polls have pointed towards the existence of a broad majority of Americans who favor smaller government. This obviously contradicts the re-election of the president and the Democratic gains in the Senate. The country is still a house divided against itself, and that’s dangerous. But it doesn’t mean that there’s been a resolution. It means in fact the opposite: there is not a resolution. That resolution still has to be made, and the making of it lies ahead of us, and not behind us.

Later on in the same interview, Hewitt said someone will go and the transcription and say that Arnn is comparing Obama and our government now to Hitler and the Third Reich. Arnn then replied by saying that the principles of Progressivism that animate our government today, which are antithetical to the principles of the American Founding, lead to policies that cannot work, will not work, and result into obvious injustices. you can read the entire issue at http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/file/archives/pdf/2012_12_Imprimis.pdf and also subscribe to *Imprimis* for free at <http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/subscriber/new>.

We definitely see that with Facebook and how it bans conservatives for speaking out against Obama but allow sites such as “It sickens me to wake up and see Sarah Palin is still alive” to remain. In fact, that is what this show today is about. Many conservatives have been banned from Facebook for certain things, whether it is sending too many friend requests or posting things that they knew FOR SURE they did not post or even speaking out in many ways against the Obama regime. That is why this Thursday there is an event put on by my guests Diane Sori of *The Patriot Factor* and Joe Newby of *The Examiner* called Freedom from Facebook Day. Diane and Joe are two people who had not given up the fight against Obama and are continuing to fight on even when Facebook shows its liberal bias. They are TRUE PATRIOTS and two people I am glad are on our side. I asked the question at the end of the editorial on January 5, and I will ask it again. “Will you give up, or will you fight on?”

Obama is no Reagan (he is no Clinton, either)

(Written October 6, 2013)

During Barack Obama's first term, we had heard comparisons between him and Ronald Reagan or him and Abraham Lincoln. Now I will not touch the Abraham Lincoln comparison, but will say that there is no comparison between Obama and Reagan. Hell, there is not even any comparison between him and Bill Clinton.

What so I mean by that? Well, the past two major times that the economy was on the verge of a shutdown was during the Reagan years and then in 1995 when Clinton was president. Now both Reagan AND Clinton had the decency to reach across the aisle to the House Speaker (Reagan with Tip O'Neill and Clinton with Newt Gingrich) and try to avert or (in Clinton's case) end a shutdown. In Reagan's case, he was one who maintained a cordial relationship with O'Neill and would go out for a beer even though they were bitter enemies and possibly rip into each other over the bargaining table if we take what Chris Matthews wrote about in his book about Reagan and O'Neill. Also, I do not think we had read where Reagan or Clinton had deprived guests or veterans from going to the World War II memorial and paying homage to the greatest generation like Obama has done recently.

Here are the facts. From Gerald Ford to Bill Clinton, there were 17 prior shutdowns among the five presidents and they were ALL negotiated. There were no shutdowns under George W. Bush probably because of what happened on September 11, 2001 to bring both Republicans and Democrats together. Now under Obama this is the largest shut-down and this is because both Obama and Harry Reid (Senate Democrat, aka Majority, Leader from Nevada) have shut down the Federal Government because they REFUSE to give the common people the same waivers that Obama has ALREADY given to Big Corporations, Unions, Congress, and other Democrat donors. The reason the Republicans took over the House in 2010 is because they had seen Obama ram ObamaDoesn'tCare (f/t to Herman Cain) down out throats, and when Princess Pelosi said that they "need to pass the bill to find out what is in it, away from the fog of the controversy," they are looking at it now and are wanting to pull a Snagglepuss and "exit, stage left even" from being subject to ObamaDoesn'tCare.

It seems that Reid had not read ObamaDoesn'tCare nor does he care to find out what is in it, leading the charge in the Congress and in the media by calling the Tea Party anarchists, arsonists, jihadists, and suicide bombers. Well let me tell you something Mr. Reid. If supporting and defending the Constitution of the United States, as well as wanting to get back to the founding principles that made America exceptional, is what makes one a suicide bomber, well then I do not speak for my listeners or my co-host but count me in that number if ANYTHING to deprive you of that cushy Majority Leader office and position you so enjoy in the Senate. Just like Katy Abram told Arlen Specter at a town hall meeting in 2009, "you, dear sir, have awakened a sleeping giant." Oh sure you might have maintained the majority in the Senate and your golden boy Obama has maintained the White House, but his downfall is coming. I know Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton. I have lived under the administrations of Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton. Barack Obama, dear sir, is NO Ronald Reagan or Bill Clinton. And the People have seen it and are rising up to try to do whatever they can to make sure Obama's reign of errors comes to an end in a legal fashion.

Impeaching Obama? Not a wise idea

(Written June 15, 2013)

It really frosts me when I hear people say how we should impeach Barack Obama because of Benghazi and Fast and Furious. While I do feel that Obama should be held culpable for Benghazi and Fast and Furious, impeachment is not the way to go, and here is why. There have only been two sitting Presidents who have been impeached in the history of the United States. The first one was Andrew Johnson in 1868 and the second one was Bill Clinton in 1999. Both Johnson and Clinton were acquitted, as the votes in the Senate to impeach failed with 2/3 of the Senate not voting guilty. The two impeachments went as follows:

In 1868 Andrew Johnson was impeached in a fierce battle with the Radical Republicans after the Civil War. The charge was Vote to impeach the president of high crimes and misdemeanors and the House voted to file the impeachment charges 126 - 47. However, in the Senate, where 36 Senators out of a total of 54 were required to vote guilty in order for the impeachment charge to stick, the vote fell short by one vote, 35 - 18

In 1999 Bill Clinton was impeached on four charges (two counts of perjury, obstruction of justice, and abuse of power) and only two stuck. One count of perjury passed 228 - 206, and obstruction of justice passed 221 - 212. The second count of perjury fell 205 - 229, and the charge accusing Clinton of abuse of power fell 148 - 285. OF the two charges which passed in the House, the Senate, with 67 senators out of a total of 100 required to vote guilty in order for the impeachment charges to stick, failed to do so. The perjury count failed 45 - 55 and the obstruction of justice count failed 50 - 50.

Diane Sori of The Patriot Factor had written a very interesting Op-ed on this very subject.

In order to impeach a sitting president the House of Representatives needs a simple majority vote, but to obtain a conviction in the Senate a two-thirds majority (67 votes) is needed. Unfortunately, with the current Democratic controlled Senate this is NOT likely to happen, so the Republicans are looking forward to the 2014 elections to try to take back the Senate.

But another year is too long to wait to avenge the MURDERS of Ambassador Stevens, Information Officer Sean Smith, and ex-Navy SEALs Tyrone Woods and Glen Doherty. Too long and with NO guarantee that the Republicans will even take back control of the Senate for we all know that Obama will 'fix' the mid-terms with voter fraud and machine 'irregularities' just like he did in November.

After all, this time his neck is on the line...literally.

And even if he was by an outside chance impeached, impeachment gives credibility to his presidency and all his misguided policies and laws would still stay in place...something we surely do NOT want. Also, remember that once charges are brought for impeachment and they fail in the Senate, it's over and cannot be brought back again. "If we cannot impeach Obama, then what CAN we do?" Well, Diane gives us the answer later on in her blog entry:

The simple fact is that Barack HUSSEIN Obama can and should be arrested for treason under Article 3, Section 3 of the Constitution which states, "Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort..."

Meaning in NO uncertain terms that the betrayal of the United States of America by consciously and purposely acting to aid her enemies is indeed grounds for treason.

And treason fits Obama to a tee for this man NOT only sends monies to our enemies (like the Muslim Brotherhood and Hamas), but I believe that Barack HUSSEIN Obama was sending, without Congressional approval, guns and weapons to Syrian rebels, rebels with direct ties to al-Qaeda, got caught by Ambassador Stevens, who then had to be silenced at all costs.

She then finishes it up by saying:

So my friends, impeachment is but a slap on the wrist and won't do for Barack HUSSEIN Obama or for Hillary Clinton for that matter. Arrest, try, convict, and sentence carried out for treason, aiding and abetting the enemy, murder, and crimes against America is the way to go.

And along with Article 3, Section 3 of the Constitution there is a possibility that the military could arrest Obama and bring him before a military tribunal. A military tribunal is a military court designed to try members of enemy forces during times of war. A definitive case can be made that Barack HUSSEIN Obama, by his actions or should I say deliberate lack of actions in regards to Benghazi, is a member of our enemy's forces.

And it's also appropriate to subject a private citizen to a military tribunal if that person is being tried for treason, which would be the case with Hillary Clinton...a now private citizen who knew of the gun-running...who covered it up...and who lied about it all thus aiding and abetting the enemy.

Read the whole thing on The Patriot Factor, and support a TRUE PATRIOT, a REAL AMERICAN in Diane Sori!

An apology to the Founding Fathers

(Written January 12, 2013)

My friend Laurin Moreno had written something on December 15, 2012, which really put things in perspective nowadays.

Dear Founding Fathers:

I'm sorry that after all we have been through as a nation that we cannot see when something is wrong under our very eyes.

I'm sorry that we have become so dependent on government instead of on ourselves.

I'm sorry that we care more for our enemies overseas than we do our allies.

I'm sorry that in times of tragedy that people will use their political beliefs to get their agendas across.

I'm sorry that we have been so arrogant as a Nation, thinking that nothing or no one will harm us.

I'm sorry that we are electing people to Office without vetting them.

I'm sorry that we have come to a point where free speech is considered a hate crime.

I'm sorry for those who think we are on the right track when we are coming so close to falling off a cliff, financially, economically, and morally.

I'm sorry that good is being called evil and that evil is being called good.

I'm sorry that people who live today do not realize the struggles you all went through to get yourselves from under the thumb of the British and make America what it is today.

I'm sorry that we have become a nation where we can sit back and watch someone die without even trying to help them.

I'm sorry that we are fast becoming the government from which you fought so hard to break away.

I'm sorry that we have a president who has been spitting on the Constitution ever since...ever since before he got into Office and after. In his opinion, the Constitution is flawed.

I'm sorry that after such tragedies like Fort Hood, Operation Fast and Furious, the oil spill in Florida, the theater shooting in Colorado, the death of Team SEAL Six, Benghazi, and just recently the shooting in an elementary school in Connecticut, that people still can't see our President as someone who is only looking out for himself.

I'm sorry that we elected a president whose background includes: growing up around those who worshiped terrorism, racism, socialism, communism, Marxism, and Saul Alinsky. Add to that the fact that anyone who knew the president for what he really is and who tried to come forward and warn U.S. citizens, especially when he was running for President the first time, have been killed, or have disappeared.

I'm sorry we have a president who apologizes to other countries for America being America.

I'm sorry we have a president who supplies our enemies with OUR weapons.

I'm sorry we have a president who gets our men and women in uniform killed because he keeps bowing to our enemies and making their missions much more dangerous with ridiculous Rules of Engagement.

I'm sorry we have a president, a Senate, and a House of Representatives who continue to dig our country even deeper into debt while imposing disastrous regulations on small businesses while catering to big businesses, forcing banks to make "bad loans" in order to be ALLOWED to expand and in the process killing American jobs.

I'm sorry that we try to see the good in people-especially our elected officials— when, day after day, year after year, they continue to intentionally hurt America and its people emotionally and physically.

I'm sorry that ignorance, stupidity, and gullibility is the new norm.

I'm sorry that the murdering of the unborn is just all right, when in the Declaration of Independence it clearly states that people have the right to LIFE, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I'm sorry that even America's most patriotic people can't even see the evil that pervades most of our elected officials, especially our current president who is the most evil, anti-America president that we have ever had.

I'm sorry that U.S. citizens take their rights-something that most countries do not have-for granted.

I'm sorry that, instead of telling people of certain religions and ethnic backgrounds to integrate, we have to treat them like they are someone special.

I'm sorry that hardworking, law-abiding citizens are having everything taken from them by those who do the opposite.

Most of all, I'm sorry that everything you all have fought and died for is being thrown away, daily. If all of you were here right now, you would probably look at us in disgust and think, "If we knew America was going to be like this, we would not have ever broken away from Britain."

No truer words have been spoken. She had summed up in 739 words what many have tried to say in in the past 20 years. America is suffering, and the Founders are probably spinning in their graves seeing the once beautiful country that they bled and died for being turned into the despotic cesspool that it is now, no thanks to Obama and his cronies. We need to do all that we can to take this country back. Everyone should ask themselves one question which I had spoken of in my editorial last week: Will you give up, or will you fight on?

Elections are like College Football and Basketball Postseasons

(Written March 17, 2012)

With the College Basketball tournament in full motion, and reading all of the results from the past four days, I got to thinking about the past three election seasons. In a way, these election seasons are like a mix of both the College basketball and the College Football Postseason. Why do I also mention College Football?

Simply put, the past two presidential elections are like the College Football postseason in that the establishment (on both the Republican and Democrat sides) have forced their candidate on us, just like our two choices in the form of #1 vs. #2 in the insipid Bowl Championship Series standings.

Now while the past two presidential elections have our candidates already named for us, Congressional elections (as well as the Democrat Presidential Primary in 2008 and the Republican Presidential Primary now) are like the NCAA College Basketball Tournament in that just as the 68 (current) teams play to see who will be the National College Basketball Champion, WE THE PEOPLE vote for who we want as a nominee. Sometimes we see upsets (like mid-major Butler University making it to the Final Four the past couple of years only to lose in the National Championship game) and sometimes we see the favorites survive and win (like #1 seed Duke University in 2010). We also see buzzer-beater shots making people heroes (like Christian Laettner's buzzer beater) and also shots making people goats (like Gordon Hayward missing the final second shot in the 2010 National Championship Game vs. Duke)

This year's Republican Presidential Primary has seen many people as front runners (Rick Perry, Herman Cain, Newt Gingrich, Rick Santorum, and Mitt Romney) and we have also seen many gaffes (like Perry's oops comment during a debate)

However, one constant has remained true throughout this primary. That is WE THE PEOPLE are deciding, and we will continue to decide the nominee, whether said nominee gets 1,144 delegates between now and June 26 (the last primary) or by way of a brokered (or contested) convention the week of August 27-30 at the Republican National Convention.

If you are an American and have not voted as of yet (in the states and territories that have primaries and caucii coming up) please exercise your privilege (Note: it is not a right to vote, as there is no right to vote in a presidential election, but that is for another show) to vote for whoever your candidate may be. Will your candidate be a Butler, or will your candidate be a Duke?

The Tea Party

(Written on April 14, 2012)

I am not a member of any tea parties here in Fort Myers, Florida. However, I am affiliated with a couple online and also know a lot of Tea Party supporters, so to read this letter to the editor in The News Press on Monday, April 2, 2012 is real disturbing to me

Make Believe

Tea parties are for little girls with imaginary friends.

Brendan Lally, Fort Myers

And then on the next page to see the Headline by E.J. Dionne of the Washington Post entitled “Tea Party tosses traditions of conservatism overboard” really got my blood pressure soaring. If it were not for a Tea Party, there would be no America today. No, I do not mean the Tea Party protests and the elections of 2009 - 2010. I am going further back.

Let us step into the time machine and take a trip to Colonial Boston in 1773. At the time Great Britain had ruled over the colonies. On May 10, King George had put the royal seal of approval on the Tea Act, which was supposed to convince the colonists to purchase Company tea on which the Townshend Duties were paid, thus implicitly agreeing to accept Parliament’s right of taxation. It had also granted the Company the right to directly ship its tea to North America and the right to the duty-free export of tea from Britain, although the tax imposed by the Townshend Acts and collected in the colonies remained in force.

The Colonists were not pleased, and as such recognized the implications of the Act’s provisions, and a coalition of merchants and artisans similar to that which had opposed the Stamp Act of 1765 mobilized opposition to delivery and distribution of the tea. The company’s authorized consignees were harassed, and in many colonies successful efforts were made to prevent the tea from being landed. This culminated in the Boston Tea Party where colonists (some disguised as Native Americans) boarded tea ships anchored in the harbor and dumped their tea cargo overboard. The group (led by Samuel Adams) numbered somewhere between 30 and 130 colonists dressed as Mohawk Indians who had boarded the Dartmouth, Beaver, and Eleanor and destroyed and tossed 342 chests of tea overboard into Boston Harbor in the span of three hours. This was one of the fuses which led to the American Revolutionary War. Granted, there were other events which precipitated the colonists to revolt, but the Boston Tea Party set the stage for the final straw to the colonists to break ties from England.

If it were not for those patriots, those Sons of Liberty, there would be no America now. In 2009 with ObamaCare on the forefront and also the stimulus bill, people were fed up with Obama’s policies that they revolted. Not with throwing tea into harbors or even going out into the streets with guns and hacksaws, but rather with loud voices and constitutions in their hands and confronted their Senators and Congressmen who had put in their support for ObamaCare and the stimulus, as well as a few laws like Dodd-Frank and Sarbanes-Oxley. That led to the election of Scott Brown to fill Ted Kennedy’s seat in Massachusetts in January, 2009 after Kennedy died as well as the massive election in 2010 when the Republicans took back the House with victories by Allen West, Michelle Bachman, and other Representatives backed by the Tea Party.

The Tea Party IS alive and well in 2012 also. Granted, there have been many of the Tea party darlings like Rubio, Ryan, and others who have backed Mitt Romney for president, but they are in no way establishment based now, which is what many have said on Facebook, Twitter, and other social media outlets. May we do what we can to keep the House, take back the Senate, and evict Obama from the White House in 2012. To quote Darrell Lee in The Patriot Zone on Facebook,

Dear President Obama,

The answer to 2012 is 1773.

Retrospectively Yours,

The Tea Party

Online Social Media Tea Party

(Written April 14, 2012)

There is a reason I had titled this rant like I did. Back in July during the debt ceiling debacle Hugh Hewitt, a talk radio host as well as a columnist for TownHall.com, mentioned that a “Twitter Tea Party” is needed. I had tweeted a couple of things during that Tea Party, and think that another one is needed right now. Only thing is I will go one better. What we need is just as I had mentioned in the title of this blog entry, an ONLINE SOCIAL MEDIA Tea Party.

As far as I know, there are 8 forms of Social Media online right now:

Facebook (<http://www.facebook.com>)

Twitter (<http://www.twitter.com>)

Tumblr (<http://www.tumblr.com>)

LinkedIn (<http://www.linkedin.com>)

Digg (<http://www.digg.com>)

YouTube (<http://www.youtube.com>)

any and all blogs

any and all message boards

(NOTE: If there are any others I am forgetting, please let me know. Also, I realize I am missing sites like RedState, Tea Party Patriots, Tea Party Nation, and FreedomWorks and FreedomConnector as well, but I have included them in the final two forms.)

With sites like Facebook and Twitter, I would propose we find out the online pages of ALL of the political figures - whether they are local, state, or national - and post on their sites, telling them how you think they are doing and just let them know what you would like to see enacted on either a bill or some other pending legislation, as well as your thoughts on how they had voted on prior pieces of legislation. Also, Facebook and Twitter are good sites to post articles and other items to let people know what is happening not only in America but all around the world.

With sites like Tumblr, LinkedIn, and Digg, I would propose that we find articles and other items, like we did with Facebook and Twitter, and post them to our pages to let people know what is happening. This way we can get the word out and keep others up to date on what is happening.

In the event that the articles we had found are already posted to Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr, LinkedIn, or Digg by others, we should like, share, Retweet, Digg, and/or even comment on them.

With YouTube, we have a choice of either uploading a video of our own opinions on certain events, uploading videos of rallies or speeches, or commenting on the videos which are already out there.

For the various blogs and message boards out there, we can employ the same methods we used above, especially sharing them on the other social media outlets. This way the same articles get multiple coverage.

Why do I say post the same articles on all forms of social media? The answer is real simple. You might have different friends on Facebook than you do on Twitter (for example) and as such your Twitter friends might not be aware of a certain issue if you had only posted it to Facebook. I use all of the above social media outlets and there are some friends who are one outlet but not on others. If you only post to one social media outlet and then tell your friends on another they might feel out of the loop if they had not read a certain article, blog entry, or anything else. That is why we should cover ALL of the social media outlets, regardless of what they are, and get the word out there. If you are interested in a Social Media Tea Party, please let me know and hopefully we can try to work something out. My email and Instant Messengers are always open and available for discussion about this.

How the Right owns talk radio

(Written April 21, 2012)

In my last editorial, I mentioned how we needed an online Social Media Tea Party. In the various methods used, it seemed like I had neglected one other main form of social media. That form is online radio. There are a lot of online radio stations and talk show hosts out there, from those who are nationally known like Tony Katz (who I consider to be “The Godfather of online radio” because he is doing for online radio what Rush Limbaugh had done for AM/FM/Satellite Radio), Dana Loesch (who, though on a terrestrial FM station out of St. Louis, MO, I consider to be in this genre based on her involvement with the Tea Party), Larry O’Connor, Hugh Hewitt, and others, to those relative unknowns like Stephen Vandergast (The voice of BlogTalk Radio), Tessler, (The dean of BlogTalk Radio), Annie the Radio Chick (aka Southern Sense), G-Ski Rocks, Dana Smearman, Toni Walsh, Michelle Ray, Kira Davis, and others. In this online radio station and talk show host genre you could even include those outside of BlogTalk Radio, like my good friends at the Texas Or Busted Media Empire, Justin Kendall, Titan 92, NJ Libertarian, Rob Alloy IV, PrarieDog SD, and even Texas or Busted himself.

What I am getting at is that online radio (and I will even take it one step further and say Talk Radio as a whole) is one method that we as Conservatives are good at. Why? Let us take two hypothetical liberals: John Doe the liberal columnist for the New Yan Times and Joe Schnook of a liberal talk show based out of New Yan City. John runs a column which is featured in 500 papers across the country and Joe is a host of a talk show which is heard on 500 stations across the country. They both say the same thing in the column and radio show daily. Both of which are listened to or read by millions of people nationwide, with differing results. Liberals applaud their words, and there are many other listeners and readers who are of the opinion that what they had heard and read is the biggest bunch of bovine excrement they have heard in a long time. But there is a vast difference.

What is that difference you ask? The columnist goes into his cushy office and lights up a cigar while his email and newspaper office box is filled with letters of outrage as well as columns and articles sent by readers with proof that what he says is totally debunked by research and facts. However, he has a secretary which screens every letter and email he receives, and as such he does not read the hate mail that comes in. The talk show host, on the other hand, is in a dilemma. He is seeing the phones light up and has to defend his position against the same arguments which the readers to the columnist had sent via email and postal mail.

You see, the columnist has an isolation which allows him to protect his image as a genius, facing challenges only when he wants to. Now the talk show host does not have that liberty. He crumbles under the onslaught of the callers with a different viewpoint and argument. At the end of the day both the columnist and the talk show host go home. The columnist with a sense of pride that his word is out there and he had not seen any contrarian response because of his secretary. The talk show host with a sense of humiliation, having limped to the end of the show being battered and bloodied under the crushing stones of fact and logic.

Oh sure the liberal talk show host might not have to tell his producer not to put any calls on the air, but with all of the talking points of the left about how evil America and Conservatives are, as well as how individualism is not the way to go, they might have a difficult time filling up the remaining two hours and thirty minutes to two hours and forty-five seconds of their show.

Ladies and gentlemen, talk radio is one social media venue where we as Conservatives own and control the narrative. There are many ways to get involved in talk radio both online and offline. Online, you can tune into good shows like this one, like The TPZ Forum, like Mitchell and Ray, like Socialism is not an Option, like The Conservative Watchtower, like NoBamanation, like Soldiers of Patriotism, like Women Patriots, like Live and Direct with G-Ski Rocks and the Captain, like TB-TV and it’s companion the Contingency Show, and call in to participate. Offline you can call into your local talk shows or even to good national syndicated shows like Rush, like Boortz, like Levin, like Savage, like Hannity, and call in to participate. You can also plug your favorite shows both online and offline via the other social media venues I mentioned last week. Online you can also host your own show via UStream,

LiveStream, and even right here on BlogTalk Radio. We HAVE the edge, we OWN the narrative as far as talk radio goes. Let us do what we can to maintain that edge, to keep owning that narrative.



End of the Year Retrospective

(Written December 28, 2012)

Well, 2012 is fast coming to an end believe it or not. So much had happened that it is hard to fit into a blog, both event-wise as well as the friends I had made online. I would like to say to everyone first, thank you for being an inspiration to me this year. Each of you had brought much joy and passion into my life in 2012. Some of you more than others and I will get into that later. One main thing is though we had not met face to face (and for 80% of you I would like to just because you mean a lot to me) you had treated me not as one with a handicap like many I had met in my real life have done. Rather, you welcomed me into your online world as a “normal” person.

Now granted there might be some things we disagree on, and for a few we even came down to verbal blows to the point I wished I would have climbed through the computer monitor and throttle you, but at least for the most part we have been civil to each other and handled our disagreements like gentlemen and not like animals. There are still a couple of issues we disagree on and in 2013 I will get into why I believe the way I do a little more. However, I also realize we are all on the same page and have the same goal in mind - the betterment of America.

There are certain people I would like to thank personally. I had done so in my blog entry on Christmas Day, but will say it here once more.

To Michael B. Smith - we have been through thick and thin from our days on the Herman Cain Dashboard back in the Summer of 2011. While we might have parted ways back in late December 2011 to early January 2012 due to you supporting Santorum when I supported Mr. Newt, I am ever thankful to you for allowing me 2 hours every Saturday to vent and let my crazed mind roam on Conservative Nation Radio.

To Harriet Baldwin and Patricia Baber - Thank you both for being former co-hosts with me on Red, Right, and Blue. No matter what, I still consider you a part of the Red, Right, and Blue family as well as a part of the Conservative Nation Radio family.

To Billie Cotter - Thank you for stepping up and being my co-host on Red, Right, and Blue. We might disagree on a couple of things, but no matter what we always make the show as interesting and intriguing as can be.

To Becca Lower - You have come a long way in the year or so since we had met. I am thankful you had stepped in for Patricia that one time on Red, Right, and Blue and that catapulted you into making your own blog and now your own website at Lowering the Boom. Keep up the good work.

I know there are others I might be forgetting, but as I said at the outset you all have been an inspiration to me over the past year. I would like to wish you all a very happy New Year. Here's to good friends and good times now and in the year to come!

Merry Christmas! (from my Conservative Blog)

(Written December 25, 2012)

I know I had not posted here in a while, more or less dealing with my rant blog and also my radio show blog, but I have to thank many people whom I had met throughout the 2012 campaign.

To Michael B. Smith - we have been through thick and thin from our days on the Herman Cain Dashboard back in the Summer of 2011. While we might have parted ways back in late December 2011 to early January 2012 due to you supporting Santorum when I supported Mr. Newt, I am ever thankful to you for allowing me 2 hours every Saturday to vent and let my crazed mind roam on Conservative Nation Radio.

To Texas or Busted and the gang at Own The Narrative - I know I have not been with you since the beginning, but I thank you for welcoming me into the fold and letting me say some of the most off the wall things from time to time.

To Harriet Baldwin and Patricia Baber - Thank you both for being former co-hosts with me on Red, Right, and Blue. No matter what, I still consider you a part of the Red, Right, and Blue family as well as a part of the Conservative Nation Radio family.

To Billie Cotter - Thank you for stepping up and being my co-host on Red, Right, and Blue. We might disagree on a couple of things, but no matter what we always make the show as interesting and intriguing as can be.

To Robert Stacy McCain - I know we had not talked all that much on Twitter, but in the few conversations we had, you are a very wise person. Keep up the good work with The Other McCain, one of the best blog out there as far as news goes.

To Becca Lower - You have come a long way in the year or so since we had met. I am thankful you had stepped in for Patricia that one time on Red, Right, and Blue and that catapulted you into making your own blog and now your own website at Lowering the Boom. Keep up the good work.

To Tamara Holder - I knew the first time I heard you on Sean Hannity's Radio Show that you are one of the few liberals (or leftists) that I can tolerate, and I was right. You and Sean have the best interaction I have ever seen, and every time I see you on his show or anywhere on Fox News Channel I always grin because you are passionate in your beliefs but you do it with class.

I know there are others I might be forgetting, but you all have been an inspiration to me over the past year. I would like to wish you all a very Merry Christmas and a wonderful New Year. Here's to good friends and good times now and in the year to come!

My thoughts on the horrific shooting in Connecticut

(Written December 15, 2012)

Words cannot describe the feelings and emotions I am going through right now over this shooting. Luckily there have been others like Robert Stacy McCain and Becca Lower for their wonderful pieces (which I will link to toward the end of this entry) on this situation. One thing I have to say — and I had said it after the shooting in Aurora, Colorado, earlier this year and after other shootings — is that guns don't kill people; gun LAWS kill people. This can be seen in other parts of the world where strict gun laws were in effect throughout history, notably in Cambodia under Pol Pot, Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler, Russia (the old Soviet Union) under Stalin, and other places. Strict gun laws, where the government says that citizens cannot have firearms, lead to the government taking over every aspect of the citizens' lives to the point that it becomes a totalitarian society.

And regardless of what we all think of Obama's policies, I think he spoke right from the heart when he addressed the nation at 3:15 PM Eastern. In my mind, this was ALMOST like his speech after the Aurora shooting earlier this year and also the heinous shooting in Arizona which took the lives of 6 people and severely wounded then-Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords (D-Arizona) where he spoke truly from the heart. Do I believe him? Mayhap not, but then too now is not the time for politics but rather for prayers and healing. If he were to speak this way all the time, then who knows? After all, there is a saying I hear often (do not know how it originated) which goes "A broken clock is right twice a day." Mayhap this is the time in which Obama got it right. Now tomorrow he might say something which might make me despise his policies as normal, but today he spoke not as a President but rather as a father.

LINKS COVERING CONNECTICUT SHOOTING

<http://theothermccain.com/2012/12/14/connecticut-school-shooting/> - Robert Stacy McCain's updates on the Connecticut shooting (The Other McCain)

<http://www.beccalower.com/connecticut/> - Becca Lower's story on the Connecticut shooting (Lowering The Boom)

<http://lonelyconservative.com/2012/12/shooting-at-elementary-school-in-newtown-ct/> - The Lonely Conservative's article on the Connecticut shooting

<http://victorygirlsblog.com/?p=9016> - The Victory Girls' article on the Connecticut shooting (with video)

<http://www.breitbart.com/Big-Journalism/2012/12/14/Libs-Immediately-Politicize-Conn-School-Shooting> - Liberals immediately make the shooting about politics (via Breitbart)

<http://www.twitlonger.com/show/kbmk9> - CBS News' Mark Knoller with the transcript of Obama's speech

<http://thepatriotfactor.blogspot.com/2012/12/op-ed-tears-horror-and-sadness-on.html> - Diane Sori's Op-Ed on the Connecticut Shooting in the Patriot Factor

<http://www.thenationalpatriot.com/2012/12/15/weekend-edition-its-not-less-guns-its-more-god/> - Craig Andersen's piece on what we need more after this crisis in the National Patriot

<http://www.teapartynation.com/forum/topics/liberals-are-responsible-for-the-tragedy> - Judson Phillips on who is really responsible for this tragedy on Tea Party Nation

http://www.bigdawgmusicmafia.com/profiles/blogs/the-same-old-story-in-a-newtown?xg_source=activity - Chip Murray's blog entry on the same old story in a Newtown on Big Dawg Music Mafia

<http://clashdaily.com/2012/12/new-rule-all-teachers-should-be-required-to-carry-guns/#ixzz2F4gY0LFX> - Doug Giles on a new rule that should be implemented after the Connecticut shooting on ClashDaily

'Twas the night before Christmas - Marine style

(Written December 8, 2012)

Just saw this in a link in my email Thursday:

Merry Christmas, My Friend

'Twas the night before Christmas, he lived all alone,
In a one-bedroom house made of plaster and stone.

I had come down the chimney, with presents to give
and to see just who in this home did live.

As I looked all about, a strange sight I did see,
no tinsel, no presents, not even a tree.

No stocking by the fire, just boots filled with sand.

On the wall hung pictures of a far distant land.

With medals and badges, awards of all kind,
a sobering thought soon came to my mind.

For this house was different, unlike any I'd seen.

This was the home of a U.S. Marine.

I'd heard stories about them, I had to see more,
so I walked down the hall and pushed open the door.

And there he lay sleeping, silent, alone,

Curled up on the floor in his one-bedroom home.

He seemed so gentle, his face so serene,

Not how I pictured a U.S. Marine.

Was this the hero, of whom I'd just read?

Curled up in his poncho, a floor for his bed?

His head was clean-shaven, his weathered face tan.

I soon understood, this was more than a man.

For I realized the families that I saw that night,
owed their lives to these men, who were willing to fight.

Soon around the Nation, the children would play,

And grown-ups would celebrate on a bright Christmas day.

They all enjoyed freedom, each month and all year,
because of Marines like this one lying here.

I couldn't help wonder how many lay alone,
on a cold Christmas Eve, in a land far from home.

Just the very thought brought a tear to my eye.

I dropped to my knees and I started to cry.

He must have awoken, for I heard a rough voice,

"Santa, don't cry, this life is my choice

I fight for freedom, I don't ask for more.

My life is my God, my country, my Corps."

With that he rolled over, drifted off into sleep,

I couldn't control it, I continued to weep.

I watched him for hours, so silent and still.

I noticed he shivered from the cold night's chill.

So I took off my jacket, the one made of red,
and covered this Marine from his toes to his head.

Then I put on his T-shirt of scarlet and gold,
with an eagle, globe and anchor emblazoned so bold.
And although it barely fit me, I began to swell with pride,
and for one shining moment, I was Marine Corps deep inside.
I didn't want to leave him so quiet in the night,
this guardian of honor so willing to fight.
But half asleep he rolled over, and in a voice clean and pure,
said "Carry on, Santa, it's Christmas Day, all secure."
One look at my watch and I knew he was right,
Merry Christmas my friend, Semper Fi and goodnight
Written by Corporal James M. Schmidt

The greatest danger to our freedom

(Written December 1, 2012)

Here is a very interesting piece that Blake Stephens had posted in The Patriot Zone.

Some of you print notices to groups of folk. My hope is that ALL of you will read to the last line of this email and if you do believe that this man of wisdom, Alexander Tyler in 1787, hit the nail on the head with his statement about Democracies, you will share this information with your clientele and friends. Even tho' we have a representative republic, I think it does apply to America today -

PS> Amazing statistics on the recent election, too.

This is the most interesting thing I've read in a long time. The sad thing about it, you can see it coming.

I have always heard about this democracy countdown.. It is interesting to see it in print. God help us, not that we deserve it.

How Long Do We Have?

About the time our original thirteen states adopted their new constitution in 1787, Alexander Tyler, a

Scottish history professor at the University of Edinburgh, had this to say about the fall of the Athenian Republic some 2,000 years earlier:

'A democracy is always temporary in nature; it simply cannot exist as a permanent form of government.'

'A democracy will continue to exist up until the time that voters discover they can vote themselves generous gifts from the public treasury.'

' From that moment on, the majority always vote for the candidates who promise the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that every democracy will finally collapse due to loose fiscal policy, which is always followed by a dictatorship.'

'The average age of the world's greatest civilizations

from the beginning of history, has been about 200 years'

'During those 200 years, those nations always progressed through the following sequence:

1. from bondage to spiritual faith;
2. from spiritual faith to great courage;
3. from courage to liberty;
4. from liberty to abundance;
5. from abundance to complacency;
6. from complacency to apathy;
7. from apathy to dependence;
8. from dependence back into bondage'

Professor Joseph Olson of Hemline University School of Law, St. Paul, Minnesota points out some interesting facts concerning the 2008 Presidential election:

Number of States won by:

Democrats: 19

Republicans: 29

Square miles of land won by:

Democrats: 580,000

Republicans: 2,427,000

Population of counties won by:

Democrats: 127 million

Republicans: 143 million

Murder rate per 100,000 residents in counties won by:

Democrats: 13.2

Republicans: 2.1

Professor Olson adds: 'In aggregate, the map of the territory Republican won was mostly the land owned by the taxpaying citizens of this great country. Democrat territory mostly encompassed those citizens living in government-owned tenements and living off various forms of government welfare...' Olson believes the United States is somewhere between the 'complacency and apathy' phase of Professor Tyler's definition of democracy, with some forty percent of the nation's

population already having reached the 'governmental dependency' phase.

If Congress grants amnesty and citizenship to twenty million criminal invaders called illegal's and they vote, then we can say goodbye to the USA in fewer than five years.

If you are in favor of this, then by all means, delete this message. If you are not, then pass this along to help everyone realize just how much is at stake, knowing that apathy is the greatest danger to our freedom.

Even though the piece Blake posted had mentioned the numbers from the 2008 election, I think we can see it more with the 2012 election which put Obama back in office on the backs of the mooches, leaches, and parasites of this nation. Those people are the ones who Neal Boortz calls the "Dumbass dumb masses" who do not care about politics or if they do, it is only for 4 months and then only want a handout and not a hand up.

I had mentioned in past blog entries that Atlas is shrugging right now, and if we do not do anything that the weight of the world will cause Atlas to throw it off of his shoulders. I am thinking that when we reach the final stage of Tyler's circle (from dependence back into bondage) that it will be too late for this country as we know it. Obama and the Democrats are fiddling while America is burning.

Corey Clagett

(Written November 17, 2012)

The year was 2006. The place was near the Muthana Chemical Complex south of Lake Thar Thar, Iraq. The backdrop was Operation Iraqi Freedom. The target was a suspected al-Qaeda in Iraq training facility southwest of the city of Samarra. Colonel Michael D. Steele commanded the 3rd Special Troops Battalion, 3rd Brigade Combat, 187th Infantry Regiment (also known as Rakkasans), 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault) and worked with Iraqi Army soldiers throughout Salah ad Din province defeating insurgents, Al Qaeda cells, and uncovering numerous caches of weapons and explosives. He sent Alpha Company to Samarra to assist the Rakkasans.

On May 9, a Blackhawk helicopter dropped Corey's squad off on an island consisting of two homes. The squad then approached one of the homes and discovered three military-aged males using two women as human shields. Corey's squad handcuffed and detained the three men while the squad leader, Staff Sergeant Girouard, radioed Command to report the three detainees. The response was, "Why aren't these terrorists dead yet?"

Girouard held a meeting of the entire squad. He then ordered Corey and another soldier, William Hunsaker, to kill the three detainees. Corey and Hunsaker were coincidentally the two lowest-ranked members of the squad.

Following the meeting, Girouard cut off the detainee's zip-ties and ordered Corey and Hunsaker to shoot them. Corey recognized that he had been given an unlawful order. However, he knew the Rules of Engagement were to "shoot to kill." Corey was aware of the Intelligence and knew that under the new "catch and release" program, the detainees would likely be released very quickly. These consequences weighed heavily on Corey as these detainees, once released, would most likely provide damaging intelligence to al Qaeda or even kill other U.S. soldiers. As the youngest and lowest ranking member of the squad, he was fearful of the consequences of disobeying the order.

Corey decided to follow the order and accompanied by Hunsaker, told the detainees to run away and then began to shoot, killing two of them. The third detainee was mortally wounded and then shot in the head by Specialist Graber. When the squad was charged and detained, Corey was abused by American guards, often going unfed and being forced to sleep in the fetal position while chained. His conditions were harsher than those at Guantanamo. While the others who were charged were let off easily, with one even being promoted and subsequently redeployed to Iraq, Corey was charged with 18 years and spent 4 years in solitary confinement in Leavenworth.

His mother, Melanie Dianiska, is trying to spearhead all efforts for the military to grant clemency for Corey. One of her efforts is taking his case to the internet, with the site <http://www.coreyclagett.com> and also taking it to various radio shows online. The intention is to garner public support for Corey and also get media attention for him. It is unfair that others had been handled with kid gloves and received lighter sentences while Corey has been handled with iron gloves and received a harsher sentence.

Brett Kimberlin

(Written May 26, 2012)

The year was 1978. The place was Speedway, Indiana. Eight bombs were set off in the span of several days. One of the bombs blew up a police car, and another blew the right leg off of a Vietnam Veteran. The bomb also severely injure the Veteran's left leg, and the damage was too great for him that he committed suicide in 1983. Police suspect a man, Brett Kimberlin, of the bombings after several store clerks mentioned that he procured bomb making materials. Also during this time an elderly lady was shot in the head because she disapproved of Kimberlin's relationship with her granddaughter.

Kimberlin was arrested along with others in a massive drug smuggling operation in Texas and was sentenced to 50 years in federal prison on impersonating a military official in addition to his convictions for the bombings and the drug smuggling charges. He was somehow paroled in the early 1990's and is now a left wing activist for Velvet Revolution along with Brad Friedman. It is interesting to note that he claimed that while in prison he sold drugs to Dan Quayle. Also, it is interesting to note that he is receiving funds from such liberal organizations and people such as Barbra Streisand, Teresa Heinz Kerry, The Tides Foundation and (mayhap) even George Soros himself.

Why am I bringing all of this up now? It has come to my attention that there have been several conservative bloggers (such as Mandy Nagy the Liberty Chick, Patterico, the late Andrew Breitbart, and now Robert Stacy McCain of The Other McCain) who have been harassed by him to the point some had lost jobs, had to move away or (possibly) even lost their life. This past Tuesday night/Wednesday morning, I was fortunate to sit in on a call with Robert Stacy McCain and heard him recount the ordeal of his dealings with Kimberlin and his associates. Ladies and Gentlemen, Kimberlin is the perfect model for the Left's alinskyesque ways, and why he needs to be stopped. I think it is messed up when the Tea Party is being derided and also when a man who had helped us get Bin Laden in Pakistan is sent away to jail for 33 years, yet KNOWN domestic terrorists like Brett Kimberlin and Bill Ayers are still out there roaming the streets without a care in the world.

Lee Stranahan, personal friend of Andrew Breitbart and the host of Darby Stranahan on BlogTalk Radio, had put together a wonderful video as to who Brett Kimberlin is. I know he had said that he declared May 25 as "Blog about Kimberlin Day" but after hearing about this I am of the belief that EVERY DAY should be Blog about Kimberlin Day as we need to get the word out there daily and let the BlameStream Media know just how dangerous Kimberlin is and that we are putting him on notice for causing ordinary citizen journalists to live their lives in fear daily.

(Thanks to Patterico and also to Robert Stacy McCain and Liberty Chick for opening our eyes to this menace)

#TwitterGulag and its ties to Brett Kimberlin

(Written June 2, 2012)

For the past 2 months, a new term had come into our vocabulary called Twitter Gulag (or as is well known on Twitter #TwitterGulag) but nobody really knows about it or why it is about. I had initially become aware of it about the end of April when I had heard that Twitter had suspended Chris Loesch's (@ChrisLoesch) account three times in the span of 2 hours, including when he was only back for 45 minutes before being blocked again. Thanks to his wife Dana Loesch (@DLoesch), Michelle Malkin (@michellemalkin) Twitchy Team (@TwitchyTeam) and others, Chris' account was reinstated.

Since then, many conservatives have had their Twitter account suspended, most recently David Morgan, who goes by the Twitter account @BlueLantern02. For some time it was unknown as to how accounts get suspended, but thanks to a site known as The Trenches, we have the inside story as to how #TwitterGulag was formed and what we can do to stop it.

Here are a few excerpts from the article:

Thanks to the work of Twitter user @SemperBanU (SBU) (give a follow, if you feel like it), the exploit, and how it was disseminated among Lefty's has become apparent. According to SBU, what the Lefty jerks discovered is that the "block and report for spam feature" IS COMPLETELY AUTOMATED. There is not a human sitting at the other end to review the reports, there's just a computer, and like any machine, it can be fooled.

So let's say you're a new Twitter user. You find your way to the #cot realm, and start following certain prominent conservatives, like Dana Loesch (@DLoesch), or Sean Hannity (@SeanHannity). You see that they will sometimes reply to random fellow conservative users. So you start to @ reply their tweets, in hopes of becoming part of the conversation or getting a retweet.

Now, here comes the system exploit. So when you @ reply them, the Twitter system sees this as an "unsolicited reply", meaning you are tweeting the person without them having asked you to. (Much like Spambots do.) Now, a large quantity of "unsolicited" replies, along with an imbalanced following/follower ratio, and what will that computer think? That you're a spambot yourself.

THE CONTENT OF YOUR TWEETS IS NOT IMPORTANT. IT'S HOW YOU ARE OPERATING WITHIN THE SYSTEM.

So if some of the Lefty's that are aware of this exploit happen across you, they can hit you with the "Block and Report for Spam" button, and the Twitter computer at the other end will look at those factors, see that it meets the criteria, and suspend the account. SBU also notes that along with @ replies, diving into a hashtag too vigorously can also make one vulnerable. Think #STOPRUSH and some of the users who seemed to get dinged by this attack when they wandered into that tag.

So basically the system is automatically run and there is nobody working it. Fair enough, but is there more behind this system? Let us read further on shall we?

According to SBU, the originator of this attack seems to be one Neal Rauhauser. (Shocking I know). At the beginning of April, Rauhauser began to contact Charles Johnson (@lizardoid and of Little Green Footballs fame), an unholy alliance if there ever was one. Rauhauser passed this fun little exploit along to Jazzytail (Charles - see: his ponytail), and Jazzytail passed it along to HIS followers and comrades, with the specific intent of targeting conservative types.

Now I know you are probably thinking that the name Neil Rauhauser sounds familiar. Well he is, as he is an associate of none other than Brett Kimberlin, the infamous Speedway Bomber and the one who had just this past Tuesday won a hearing (AUDIO at <http://soundcloud.com/nyancatlovesyou/aaron-walker-peace-hearing>) and got a peace order against Aaron Walker so Walker cannot blog, talk, or even mention Kimberlin for the remainder of the year.

In fact, Brandon Darby (@BrandonDarby) had recently engaged Occupy Rebellion (@OccupyRebellion) with the fact that he is Brett Kimberlin or associated with him. You can read the tweet at <https://twitter.com/brandondarby/status/208082103957590016>.

Now that we have Kimberlin on the defensive, what can we do to maintain it? The answer, according to The Trenches, is simple.

We can adjust our habits, but I'd rather not. This is an attack meant to discourage people from freely associating with those they want to, and there can be no doubt that it is, indeed, an attack on free speech. Hit one of Jazzytail's criteria, and he'll send his henchmen your way to click that Block and Report button.

But, seeing as how Twitter's liberal bias is pretty well confirmed, perhaps if fire was fought with fire here, and a bunch of butthurt Lefty's start complaining to Twitter about this particular exploit, something might actually happen.

You can read the whole thing at <http://thetrenches.us/2012/06/twittergulag-how-it-works-and-what-to-do/>

This election has taken on a whole new spin, especially as what had been brought out over the past week on not only this show but other shows like TB-TV and even on Fox News. We need to use this information and turn the tables on the left en route to winning the White House, maintaining the House of Representatives, and winning the Senate in November. It is in this manner that we can shut down Twitter Gulag. Until then, we need to keep the pressure on Twitter to free those who are held in Twitter Gulag, and I will keep an update as to who is in there and also their accounts so we can get them freed.

The Supreme Court Week in Review

(Written June 30, 2012)

It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way—in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only.

These words are the opening words to Charles Dickens' epic novel "A Tale of Two Cities" which was written in 1859, but they could indeed fit what had happened with the Supreme Court, nay in all of America, this past week. With the Supreme Court's bookmark rulings beginning with the ruling for Arizona in part and for Obama in part with the SB1070 ruling on Monday, and then ending with the mixed ruling on ObamaCare.

Let us begin with the ObamaCare ruling first. There are many who say that it was a bad decision by Chief Justice Roberts, but I say that he was correct in his ruling. The reason I say such is because he had handed the election over to Romney in voting the way he did. If he had voted the other way, Obama would have CLEARLY derided the decision as a ruling right down party lines and say that the Supreme Court is TOO Conservative. In this way he will not blame the Supreme Court for him being a SCOAMF. Also, what Roberts has done was made it a tax which means that it only takes 51 Senators to vote for repeal, not the 60 that it took to ram ObamaCare down our throats in 2009. And as Romney himself has said, once he is elected president, he will repeal ObamaCare.

Now on to the ruling for Arizona in SB1070. After Obama had heard the ruling he in a sense told Homeland Security to tell Arizona that they are on their own, which is typical Obama fashion. If he does not like a ruling or a vote, he basically blames everybody but himself for it. That is also typical Liberal mindset. If they do not get a job, the boss is to blame. They do bad on a test, the professor is to blame. They get into a car crash, the other driver is to blame. They never look in the mirror and say they are doing the things to get themselves in the position they are in. Ladies and gentlemen, this Supreme Court had shown us just how important this election is in November. As I had mentioned in a tweet on Thursday, The Supreme Court left us no choice now. In order to repeal ObamaCare, we must Repeal Obama in November.

The Liberal Mindset

(Written July 21, 2012)

Let me start this out by playing a segment to The Wilkow Majority where a Communist calls in trying to debate Andrew Wilkow on healthcare.

Ladies and gentlemen, the caller is typical of your run of the mill Communist Liberal who always wants government to supply for everything. The worst part is that this caller is typical of the selfish “ME” generation where instead of working for their necessities they want the necessities handed to them. This is what the Occupy Groups are fighting for, and it is insane.

I referred to the book Atlas Shrugged by Ayn Rand and also to the movie Atlas Shrugged Part I which had come out last year. The book is so very true. Atlas is shrugging based on all of the stress that has been placed on his shoulders, and one of these days the stress is going to be too much and he will have to throw that weight off his shoulders or collapse. That is similar to the economic issues here. Too much weight and stress is being placed on us and sooner or later we are going to throw that weight off or collapse underneath it. The liberal mindset is to keep adding the weight on by letting others shoulder the burden.

This November, we have a choice. Do we want to keep the stress that Obama and the Democrats have placed on our shoulders the past 4 years, or do we want to throw the weight off? Think about that when you go to the polls this November.

Career Politicians

(Written May 19, 2012)

Another election season is in the works. If you are not seeing them already, you will be seeing commercials on TV or mailings in your email or through the United States Postal Service from your Representative wanting more money and/or your support for them in the upcoming election. Chances are said politician has been in office for 20 or 40 years and done nothing for your district. You are wondering why you continue to vote for that politician and had nothing to show for it. Is there someone out there who has YOUR best interests at heart?

Well there is. That organization is called GOOOH, which stands for Get Out Of Our House. It is very fitting as the organization intends to vote out all 435 members of the House of Representatives and replace them with citizen activist, citizen statesmen if you will. GOOOH has people in all 50 states and 435 Congressional Districts with that sole purpose. Each district has three rounds (sometimes more, sometimes less depending on the district) of intense, competitive "citizen conventions" designed to pick a single candidate which is represented by GOOOH and also by the people of said conventions. Will they be successful? I do not know, but do know that it will be up to the people of that particular district if they are. The question to ask is: "are you happy with the same old career politicians who are working for the lobbyists, or do you want a citizen statesman looking out for your interest?"

On today's show you will be hearing one of these citizen statesmen. His name is Byron Donalds, and he will be representing the 19th District of Florida, where I reside. Just a bit of history the 19th District was renumbered due to the Census of 2010. Before that it was the 14th District and had been represented by Connie Mack IV (who is vacating his seat to run for the Senate) since 2005. Mr. Donalds is a businessman and a self-described constitutional conservative. He has never before competed for nor served in public office. Mr. Donalds is highly intelligent, straightforward, and refreshingly willing to put a stake in the ground on a wide variety of critical issues such as the economy and taxes, debt reduction, and healthcare reform among others. On August 14, he will be involved in a primary to see who will advance to the General Election on November 6.

Beginning now and through November 6, let us tell the career politicians to GOOOH!

Do the Math

(Written August 16, 2012)

Guest Blog by Becca Lower

So as to not to overdo things, I'll have another blog on the Rep. Paul Ryan event tomorrow. Or tonight, if there's more insomnia like last night— it's not every day that you shake the hand of the future VP.

The “math” poster, which R. Stacy McCain mentioned and pictured in his blog today, was the brain-child of David Burge (Twitter: @iowahawkblog; url: <http://iowahawk.typepad.com/>). I first heard of it earlier this week, when Breitbart News' Larry O'Connor saw it in his Twitter timeline during a commercial break. He nabbed a fill-in gig, all this week, for Chris Stigall on a huge, Philadelphia AM station. (You can also hear him on certain Saturdays on DC's WMAL; follow @larryoconnor for details.) A quick scan of Twitter and I found the image, too.

Yesterday, on my way to Oxford (home of Miami of Ohio), I was kicking myself that I hadn't brought anything better for Rep. Paul Ryan to sign than a clipping from that morning's Cincinnati Enquirer. Then it hit me. Since our local library is in the same system as Oxford's, I could pop into that branch with my library card and print the “math” image off my email.

After Ryan's speech, I braved the scrum for handshakes, photos and autographs. It wasn't a polite rope line like you'd see at a typical, GOP event (a Lincoln-Reagan dinner, for example). No, this was more like the stage being rushed at a rock concert. Ryan's a rock star, even in the level-headed Midwest. We think fiscal sanity is sexy.

Ryan had a black, permanent marker already, so shoving the picture at him was all I needed to do to get an autograph. It was unclear from his expression if he looked at the poster at all, but others in the throng liked it. After a couple seconds, I realized that he hadn't moved far along the way. (He's stopped for a photo.) So I reached out my hand, and he shook it. I wished him good luck. He said thank you.

The story behind meeting up with blogger extraordinaire Stacy McCain and his irascible thirteen year old, Jefferson (and others), will have to wait. But here's proof that McCain is on the right side of the Force.

(http://3.bp.blogspot.com/_jdR7Cf8IYM/UC2gH5o4mmI/AAAAAAAAABw/NoIJjflasM0/s320/RSMcCain081512MiamiU.jpg - Pic of Robert Stacy McCain eating Skyline Chili)

The trifecta of Cincinnati culture, all in one night: conservative politics, Reds baseball (Mike Leake on the tv in the background, throwing a complete game) and Skyline chili.

(http://2.bp.blogspot.com/_vE3K_LAgRCQ/UC2gyMPS3GI/AAAAAAAAAB4/qVS3cVPuLHQ/s320/RSMcCainMe081512Miami.jpg - pic of Robert Stacy McCain and Becca Lower

more photos tomorrow...

Update: H/T to J.d. Bryden for the info about IowaHawk.

“Jefferson, I think we’re lost”

(Written August 17, 2012)

guest post by Becca Lower

It was strange to read today, in The Hill, that some think that the Paul Ryan pick was

“The Announcement Without a Bounce: Romney’s Choice Falls Flat.” Have they talked to people in Ohio? Not only did Ryan get some encouraging greetings from Ohio seniors on Wednesday, on his way to the Miami of Ohio event, but here’s the line of people waiting to get into the Engineering Quad where he was set to speak (Note: all images are by me, and are clickable to enlarge):

It took about an hour to move from the edge of the Millett Hall parking lot to the gates. That was just enough time to finish our provisions (trail mix, cut-up veggies, day-old restaurant tortilla chips) and to chat with a man who happened to be down from Cleveland moving his underclassman son into his Miami U. dorm. Oh yes, it was early move-in day, too. So you had political junkies like Robert Stacy McCain and me from points east and south (I’m from Butler County), alongside frantic and lost mothers and fathers from all over. I overheard a man speaking to the Clevelander who’d come from somewhere in Kentucky— roughly the same five hour distance, just from the other direction.

(http://1.bp.blogspot.com/-8FGr179yQNQ/UC7OZKduZWI/AAAAAAAAAEQ/QcjE8V_98xI/s320/52340008.JPG - Ohio license plate at the event saying MITT 12)

The two stories, seeing Ryan and meeting Stacy McCain (writer of The Other McCain blog), can’t be separated. I can’t imagine the experience of Wednesday without either part. And really, McCain’s story couldn’t have served as a better counterpoint.

We got acquainted during the primaries somewhat by accident. He contacted his friend and fellow blogger Lisa Graas, the week before the Ohio contest (March 6th). He happened to be in Ohio visiting family, and hoped to mingle with some Rick Santorum supporters as we watched a debate. Although that meet-up didn’t work out, we did have a good, twenty minute phone call.

Then in late May, just days after Stacy and his family were forced to go into hiding because of the actions of Brett Kimberlin and his cohorts, he showed up (in the second or third radio interview in as many days) to tell his story on Texas or Busted TV, which I’m lucky to be a part of. (Update: He appeared on May 22:

http://static.ownthenarrative.com/media/1/1/5_22_12-2.mp3)

And then, early Wednesday, Stacy started tweeting and blogging about his surprise stop in Oxford, Ohio, to catch Paul Ryan. The opportunity of a meet-up, this close to home, was too good to resist. I quickly left a comment at his blog and at Facebook.

(http://2.bp.blogspot.com/-jC60O2i6DRo/UC7Bn1YUZ_I/AAAAAAAAAEA/AZUqW3fvGwQ/s400/52340012.JPG - Rafters at Ryan event. note campaign banner placement for another race)

(<http://4.bp.blogspot.com/-N18e7WPuYM0/UC7BD6-YQ-I/AAAAAAAAAD4/fD4PEvFpR3M/s400/52340023.JPG> - Paul Ryan speaking)

(<http://1.bp.blogspot.com/-55rnXhq4Rf8/UC63blxhohI/AAAAAAAAADg/02GlmDQJAos/s400/52340025.JPG> - Post event scrum for Ryan meet and greet)

After the event, I called Stacy’s cellphone. He picked up on the third ring. Some locals were taking him to have his first taste of Cincinnati chili, at the Skyline Chili parlor on High Street.

I met Stacy in the space between the restaurant’s two doors. He was ducking out to take a phone call. But he pointed to a back corner booth, which was full of people. Two of them were members of a local TEA party, Liberty Township. It’s under the same umbrella as our town’s group. In fact, my mom and I attended a great, Fourth of July event that they presented this year. Also sitting in the booth was a red-headed thirteen year old named Jefferson.

You might call him the other, Other McCain. He’s Stacy’s son. On my last blog, I mistakenly described him as “irascible.” He is precocious, though. After Stacy returned from his phone call, we were bantering about the number of

attendees at the event. The kid guessed (it was more of a statement, really) that there were 10,000 people. He may have a future in PR. It was closer to 2-3,000.

You expect someone who writes like Stacy does to do a little ranting about politics. He did that. But there was something I didn't expect somehow. He's a hugger, not a handshaker. To emphasize a point, he'll lightly rest his hand on your arm for a moment. It was a nice surprise.

After Skyline, our group walked back down High Street, toward the parking lot. I didn't get the full story on the McCain family's trip to Oxford, but there was something about getting lost. So as Stacy and I said our farewells, my mom went over a loaner Ohio road map with Jefferson. But as we pulled away, their car didn't head in the right direction at all. Less than a block away, their car had stopped. We caught up to them, then led them to the highway. (The title refers the R.E.M. song "Little America," from their 1984 Reckoning album. Per the wiki, "The song's (and album's) last line [is], "Jefferson, I think we're lost.")

Addendum: " Paul Ryan's Nerd Wave - Wassup!" The second picture was from this Miami of OH event... LOL, @Ali.<http://viralread.com/2012/08/16/paul-ryans-nerd-wave-wassup/>

Also: "Little America" - R.E.M. (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5twY4C9nGWQ>)

From Showtime's Rock of the 80's - Recorded live at the Palace - Los Angeles, CA - 1984 - R.E.M. : Michael Stipe - Lead Vocal Instrument; Peter Buck - Guitar; Mike Mills - Bass/Vocals; Bill Berry - Drums/Vocals

Never forget what happened 11 years ago

I know I will not. In fact, I remember exactly where I was on this day 5 years ago when I first heard about the plane striking the World Trade Center. I was at a McDonald's enjoying breakfast and listening to a local sportsradio broadcaster broadcast live from there when he broke for his 45 minutes past the hour break. I was about to walk over to him during the break and say that I wanted to speak about Michael Jordan's return to basketball and play for the Washington Wizards when I looked at his face which is that of shock. At first report it seemed to me like a small plane and that it was a freak accident, but when I heard of the second plane hit the World Trade Center I knew that this had to be some sort of planned attack. I spent the entire 9:00 hour glued to his little broadcast station as he had a set of headphones which I listened to the producer back at the station speak to him and updating him. There were other callers who chimed in with updates from the televised newscasts. After the show ended I hung around for a small time listening, then the host's dad offered to drive me to the college where I could watch the TV in the library as well as get current updates on the internet. While en route I phoned my mom and stepdad to tell them what had happened. My stepdad told me that he had heard about it and that mom was going to get me and tell me but she saw that I was gone. When I went into the library at the college to watch the news, I almost fell to the floor upon seeing the planes striking the Towers and the Pentagon. About 11:45 I got word that the college was closing and called my grandma in Chicago to ask her if she and dad knew what was happening. She said that dad was on the way to the store but that they knew what was going on. After I spoke to grandma I went home and kept the news on the TV all the time, gasping and getting angry as to what happened.

I urge people to **NEVER** forget this day for as long as they live. I encourage everyone no matter where they are that if they have the American flag to unfurl it and wave it proudly, for as Franklin Delano Roosevelt said of another terrible day in American History, "This is a day which will go down in infamy."

It is amazing how 5 years later, the horrific events of 9-11 still affects people. A lady who checked the terrorists onto that first flight that hit the towers killed herself because she couldn't deal with the guilt. Also, another checker who did the second flight... is still five years later in intense therapy. This I had found out from a woman who I had seen in a chat room where I visit often. I guess this is a lot like Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome.

Those words, written September 11, 2006, still hold true today. While the main proponents of the September 11, 2001, attacks are either dead or still imprisoned awaiting trial, we must not forget what happened that fateful day. We had been at war with Muslim extremists ever since 1784 when the first American vessel was seized by Moroccan pirates. That led to the formation of the United States Navy in March 1794 and us taking the battle to them. The Middle East has always been in the interest of the United States, as seen by historian Michael Oren in a speech given at Columbia University entitled *The Middle East and the Making of the United States, 1776 to 1815* [<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/news/05/11/michaelOren.html>]. In fact, Oren had said that the Middle East's Impact on American Affairs Is Nothing New [http://www.columbia.edu/cu/news/05/11/middle_east_impact_us.html]. Not many know or realize this, but it is true.

The Middle East will always have an impact on American affairs, regardless of who is in the White House or has control of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The only question is how the people in control of those offices handle the affairs coming out of the Middle East. Even though many people hate President George W. Bush, he knew how to handle the affairs out of the Middle East. In fact, if it were not for the intelligence and the protocols already in place, Obama would not have had the opportunity to order the death of Osama bin Ladin.

CHAPTER 5

PART FIVE: FOOTBALL AND THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

This part deals with an editorial I am just getting into now on my radio show based on a speech in the Imprimis newsletter entitled “Football and the American Character.” This will last over several weeks and I will continue to update it every week.

If you notice, there are no dates on them for now. That is because I had not read them on my radio show or posted them to my show blog for the public to see. As soon as I read them on the air I will posit the dates on here.

Football and the American Character

(Written November 16, 2013)

As I was looking over the Imprimis for September, the entire newsletter was devoted to a speech by John J. Miller of Hillsdale College on Football and the American Character. He starts the speech off as follows:

When we talk about football, we usually talk about our favorite teams and the games they play. The biggest ongoing story in the sport right now, however, is something else entirely. It's not about the Bears vs. the Packers or Michigan vs. Ohio State, but rather the controversy over concussions and the long-term health effects of head injuries

On August 29, 2013, the National Football League agreed to pay \$765 million to settle a lawsuit involving more than 4,500 players and their families, who had claimed that the league covered up data on the harmful effects of concussions. Although medical research into football and long-term effects of head injuries is hardly conclusive, some data suggest a connection. A number of legal experts believe the NFL, which will generate about \$10 billion in revenue this year, dodged an even bigger payout.

Football, of course, is much bigger than the NFL and its players, whose average yearly salary is nearly \$2 million. Football's ranks include about 50,000 men who play for schools or in youth leagues whose pockets aren't nearly so deep. A Colorado jury recently awarded \$11.5 million to a boy who suffered a paralyzing injury at his high school football practice in 2008. How long will it be before school districts begin to think football isn't worth the cost?

Earlier this year, President Obama waded into the debate. "If I had a son, I'd have to think long and hard before I let him play football," he said. He also called for football "to reduce some of the violence." Others have called for a more dramatic solution: Malcolm Gladwell, the bestselling author of *The Tipping Point* and other books, thinks football should go the way of dogfighting. He would like to see America's favorite sport run out of polite society.

So football's future is uncertain. But the past may offer important lessons. After all, football's problems today are nothing compared to what they were about a century ago: In 1905, 18 people died playing the sport. Football became embroiled in a longrunning dispute over violence and safety - and it was almost banned through the efforts of Progressive era prohibitionists. Had these enemies of football gotten their way, they might have erased one of America's great pastimes from our culture. But they lost - and it took the efforts of Theodore Roosevelt to thwart them.

Now at first blush you might think that this quote from the September issue of Imprimis is nothing, but in fact it is. In my mind we are seeing America being destroyed through the efforts of the current day Progressive era prohibitionists. The only thing is they are called Socialists and Communists. Also, in a way football leads to strengthen the American Character, and I will get into that in a future editorial. However, notice what Obama had said.

"If I had a son, I'd have to think long and hard before I let him play football," he said. He also called for football "to reduce some of the violence."

One of the reasons this sticks out to me is the fact that Obama decided to wade into it in the first place. He has many more important things (The economy, jobs, the Middle East) and yet he sees a shiny and is easily distracted by other things. This shows that he is out to destroy America one principle at a time.

From Pop Warner through high school and onto college and the pro (or semi-pro) level, football was meant to build character not only in others but also in ourselves. I will go through Miller's speech little by little and pluck out salient points. In the meantime, you can subscribe to Imprimis at <http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/subscriber/new> and read the September issue at http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/file/archives/pdf/2013_09_Imprimis.pdf so you can follow along throughout the coming weeks.

Football and the American Character (Part 2)

Last week I started talking about Football and how it shapes American character. This week I will speak of a future Rough Rider and President who was at the second game between two of the oldest schools in America and his reaction to what he had seen.

On November 18, 1876, Theodore Roosevelt, a freshman at Harvard who had just turned 18, attended his first football game. Destined for great things, he was enthusiastic about athletics in general and eager to see the new sport of football in particular. So here he was at the second game ever played between Harvard and its great rival Yale.

As Roosevelt shivered in the cold and windy fall weather, he watched a game that was quite different from the sport we know today. There were no quarterbacks or wide receivers, no first downs or forward passes. Before play began, the teams met to discuss rules. What number of men would play? What would count for a score? How long would the game last? They were like school kids today who have to set up boundaries, choose between a game of touch or tackle, and decide how to count blitzes.

Harvard's veterans agreed to a couple of suggestions proposed by Yale. The first would carry a lasting legacy: Rather than playing with 15 men to a side, as was the current custom, the teams would play with eleven men. So this was the first football game to feature eleven players on the field per team.

The second suggestion would not shape the sport's future, but it would affect the game that afternoon: Touch-downs would not count for points. Only goals-balls sailed over a rope tied between two poles-kicked after touch-downs or kicked from the field during play would contribute to the score.

In the first half, Harvard scored a touchdown but missed the kick. By the rules of the day, this meant that Harvard earned no points. At halftime, the game was a scoreless tie.

After the break, Yale pushed into Harvard territory and a lanky freshman named Walter Camp tried to shovel the ball to a teammate. It was a poor lateral pass that hit the ground and bounced upward, taking one of those funny hops that can befuddle even skilled players. In a split second, Oliver Thompson decided to take a chance on a kick from about 35 yards away and at a wide angle. The ball soared into the air, over the rope and through the uprights, giving Yale a lead of 1-0. No more points were scored that afternoon.

In a letter to his mother the next day, Roosevelt gave voice to the frustration that so often accompanies defeat in sports. "I am sorry to say we were beaten," he wrote, "principally because our opponents played very foul."

The football of Teddy Roosevelt's day is quite different from the football of our day, save for one decision on that day. Thanks to the efforts of both teams, the number of players were decreased from 15 men on the field per side to 11, the same amount of men on the field per side that we see today. However, there were no first downs, forward passes, quarterbacks, or wide receivers that we see today. Basically it was like a rugby game with scrums everywhere and anywhere in between the field of play.

Now one thing about Roosevelt is that he was enthusiastic about athletics and competitive sports overall. He was also eager to see how this new sport of football would play out, and as we will see later on, that would set him up as to how he would form his legion of Rough Riders during the Spanish-American War of 1898. The game would end in a soccer score of 1-0 because goals kicked off the foot would only count as points. And even then they would only count as one point.

In a letter after the game, Roosevelt wrote his mother saying that the opposition played very foul which is why they had won. That led to a group of people wanting to ban football and all of team sports. I will get into that next week, as well as a letter Roosevelt wrote to a player of that Harvard-Yale game who is considered as football's founding father.

Football and the American Character (Part 3)

Last week I talked about the first football game Teddy Roosevelt saw and how he was enthralled by it. Miller goes on to say how he had helped save football and how he had written to one of the players of that game

More about Teddy Roosevelt and what he did for football in a moment. But first, let me discuss briefly why football matters.

Love for a college football team, whether it's the Texas Longhorns or the Hillsdale Chargers, is almost tribal. In some cases the affiliation is practically inherited, in others chosen. Whatever the origin, football has the power to form lifelong loyalties and passions and has supplanted baseball as America's favorite pastime. Yet it almost died 100 years ago. Over the course of an ordinary football season in those days, a dozen or more people would die playing it, and many more suffered serious injuries. A lot of the casualties were kids in sandlot games, but big-time college teams also paid a price.

Football isn't a contact sport—it's a collision sport that has always prized size, strength, and power. This was especially true in its early years, when even the era of leatherheads lay in the future: Nobody wore helmets, facemasks, or shoulder pads. During the frequent pileups, hidden from the view of referees, players would wrestle for advantage by throwing punches and jabbing elbows. The most unsporting participants would even try to gouge their opponents' eyes. The deaths were the worst. They were not freak accidents as much as the inevitable toll of a violent game. And they horrified a group of activists who crusaded against football itself—wanting not merely to remove violence from the sport, but to ban the sport altogether. At the dawn of the Progressive era, the social and political movement to prohibit football became a major cause.

The New York Evening Post attacked the sport, as did The Nation, an influential magazine of news and opinion. The latter worried that colleges were becoming “huge training grounds for young gladiators, around whom as many spectators roar as roared in the [Roman] amphitheatre.” The New York Times bemoaned football's tendency toward “mayhem and homicide.” Two weeks later, the Times ran a new editorial entitled “Two Curable Evils.” The first evil it addressed was lynching. The second was football.

The main figure in this movement to ban football was Charles W. Eliot, the president of Harvard and probably the single most important person in the history of higher education in the United States. Indeed, Eliot hated team sports in general because competition motivated players to conduct themselves in ways he considered unbecoming of gentlemen. If baseball and football were honorable pastimes, he reasoned, why did they require umpires and referees? “A game that needs to be watched is not fit for genuine sportsmen,” he once said. For Eliot, a pitcher who threw a curve ball was engaging in an act of treachery. But football distressed him even more. Most of all, he despised its violence. Time and again, he condemned the game as “evil.”

One of Eliot's main adversaries in the battle over football was Walter Camp, one of the players in the game Teddy Roosevelt watched in 1876. A decent player, Camp made his real mark on football as a coach and a rules-maker. Indeed, he is the closest thing there is to football's founding father.

In the rivalry between Eliot and Camp, we see one of the ongoing controversies in American politics at its outset—the conflict between regulators bent on the dream of a world without risk, and those who resist such an agenda in the name of freedom and responsibility. Eliot and other Progressives identified a genuine problem with football,

but their solution was radical. They wanted to regulate football out of existence because they believed that its participants were not capable of making their own judgments in terms of costs and benefits. In their higher wisdom, these elites would ban the sport for all.

Into this struggle stepped Theodore Roosevelt. As a boy, he had suffered from chronic asthma to the point that relatives wondered if he would survive childhood. His mother and father tried everything to improve his health, even resorting to quack cures such as having him smoke cigars. Ultimately they concluded that he simply would have to overcome the disease. They encouraged him to go to a gym, and he worked out daily. The asthma would stay with Roosevelt for years, but by the time he was an adult, it was largely gone. For Roosevelt, the lesson was that a commitment to physical fitness could take a scrawny boy and turn him into a vigorous young man.

This experience was deeply connected to Roosevelt's love of football. He remained a fan as he graduated from Harvard, entered politics, ranched out west, and became an increasingly visible public figure.

In 1895, shortly before he became president of the New York City police commission, he wrote a letter to Walter Camp that read as follows:

I am very glad to have a chance of expressing to you the obligation which I feel all Americans are under to you for your championship of athletics. The man on the farm and in the workshop here, as in other countries, is apt to get enough physical work; but we were tending steadily in America to produce ... sedentary classes ... and from this the athletic spirit has saved us. Of all games I personally like foot ball the best, and I would rather see my boys play it than see them play any other. I have no patience with the people who declaim against it because it necessitates rough play and occasional injuries. The rough play, if confined within manly and honorable limits, is an advantage. It is a good thing to have the personal contact about which the New York Evening Post snarls so much, and no fellow is worth his salt if he minds an occasional bruise or cut. Being near-sighted I was not able to play foot ball in college, and I never cared for rowing or base ball, so that I did all my work in boxing and wrestling. They are both good exercises, but they are not up to foot ball

I am utterly disgusted with the attitude of President Eliot and the Harvard faculty about foot ball

I do not give a snap for a good man who can't fight and hold his own in the world. A citizen has got to be decent of course. That is the first requisite; but the second, and just as important, is that he shall be efficient, and he can't be efficient unless he is manly. Nothing has impressed me more in meeting college graduates during the fifteen years I have been out of college than the fact that on the average the men who have counted most have been those who had sound bodies.

As this letter indicates, Roosevelt saw football as more than a diversion. He saw it as a positive social good. When he was recruiting the Rough Riders in 1898, he went out of his way to select men who had played football. The Duke of Wellington reportedly once said, "The battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton." Roosevelt never said anything similar about football fields and the Battle of San Juan Hill, but when he emerged from the Spanish-American War as a national hero—and as someone talked about as being of presidential timber—he knew how much he owed not just to the Rough Riders, but to the culture of manliness and risk-taking that had shaped them.

One of the things that stands out in my mind is how football has supplanted baseball as America's pastime. Whether it is a tailgate party in Jacksonville for the Florida-Georgia game or the Super Bowl, football has a habit of

drawing a lot of people. In fact, I will go so far as to say that football attendance easily outpaces baseball by about 5 to 1. Another thing is that when people go to a football game, they make a day out of it, sometimes pulling into the parking lot at 7 AM for a 1 PM game. You rarely if ever see that for a baseball game.

However, if it were not for Teddy Roosevelt and Walter Camp, football would have died at the hands of Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard who despised all competitive sports. And we see that today where the progressives like Obama want to eliminate football or make it safer. Granted, as I had reported last week 18 people died in 1905 in football games. Many more suffered serious injuries, and as such certain measures were needed to make football more playable and less dangerous. Granted, there is always a hint of danger in football, but at least now it is not like it was about 100 years ago.

Football and the American Character (Part 4)

So far, we had seen the major players in the battle for football choose sides, Harvard President Charles W. Eliot who wanted to ban not only football but all team sports and Walter Camp who became the de facto founding father for the sport of football, with Teddy Roosevelt sending a letter to Camp thanking him for championing the cause of athletics. This week we continue with what Roosevelt also thought, and why sports are important for the American character.

Like Roosevelt, our society values sports, though we don't always think about why—or why we should. My kids have played football, baseball, hockey, soccer, and lacrosse. As a family, we're fairly sports-oriented. It has forced me to think about a question that a lot of parents probably ask at one time or another: Why do we want our kids to participate in athletics?

Many parents will point to the obvious fact that sports are good for health and fitness. They'll also discuss the intangible benefits in terms of character building—sports teach kids to get up after falling down, to play through pain, to deal with failure, to work with teammates, to take direction from coaches, and so on.

It turns out that there really is something to all of this. Empirical research shows that kids who play sports stay in school longer. As adults, they vote more often and earn more money. Explaining why this is true is trickier, but it probably has something to do with developing a competitive instinct and a desire for achievement.

Roosevelt was surely correct in believing that sports influence the character of a nation. Americans are much more likely than Europeans to play sports. We're also more likely to attribute economic success to hard work, as opposed to luck. It may be that sports are a manifestation—or possibly even a source—of American exceptionalism.

Miller nailed it with the last paragraph in my mind. Roosevelt saw that sports influence the character of a nation. Granted, most Europeans are passionate for their team, and we see that in some of the soccer contests, but over all – outside of hockey – we see more Americans likely to play sports than Europeans.

We also read that research has shown that children who play sports stay in school longer, vote more often, and earn more money. Now this is also true, especially given the fact that if you look about you see the multi-million dollar contracts some sports stars get, which allows them to get better housing, better cars, and a new wardrobe. Sports also teaches us the value of sportsmanship and teamwork, as well as how to deal with failure and also play through pain.

However, with all of those values and virtues, there are also a couple of downfalls. One main downfall that we see prevalent nowadays is the fact that some athletes let that success and popularity get to their head and they forget who they were. They outnumber those who take their success and parlay it to help out those less fortunate than themselves or give other children a chance to have the same success they had. Hence why you hear about more people like Alex Rodriguez, Richie Incognito, Bobby Bonds and Jerry Sandusky (who are in the news for the wrong reasons) and less about people like Mariano Rivera, Deion Sanders, Roberto Clemente and David Beckham (who had reached out to help inner city youth through organizations they had started or helped to start) nowadays.

Sports give us a chance to build our character, both in a good way and in a bad way. We would be wise to remember what the legendary UCLA basketball coach John Wooden had to say about character:

- Be more concerned with your character than your reputation, because your character is what you really are, while your reputation is merely what others think you are.
- Talent is God given. Be humble. Fame is man-given. Be grateful. Conceit is self-given. Be careful.

- Be true to yourself, help others, make each day your masterpiece, make friendship a fine art, drink deeply from good books - especially the Bible, build a shelter against a rainy day, give thanks for your blessings and pray for guidance every day.
- Whatever you do in life, surround yourself with smart people who'll argue with you.



Football and the American Character (Part 5)

Last week we had talked about Roosevelt believing in sports building American character. This week I will discuss how Roosevelt has invited Walter Camp and a few other people to the White House, and how that meeting brought football into the modern era.

When Roosevelt ascended to the presidency, football remained controversial and Harvard's Eliot continued his crusade for prohibition. In 1905, Roosevelt was persuaded to act. He invited Walter Camp of Yale to the White House, along with the coaches of Harvard and Princeton. These were the three most important football teams in the country. "Football is on trial," said Roosevelt. "Because I believe in the game, I want to do all I can to save it." He encouraged the coaches to eliminate brutality, and they promised that they would.

Whether they meant what they said is another matter. Walter Camp didn't see anything wrong with the way football was played. Harvard's coach, however, was a young man named Bill Reid. He took Roosevelt more seriously, because he took the threat to football more seriously. Indeed, within weeks of meeting with Roosevelt, he came to fear that Eliot was on the verge of success in having Harvard drop the sport, which would have encouraged other schools to do the same.

At the end of the 1905 season, therefore, Reid plotted with a group of reform-minded colleges to form an organization that today we know as the NCAA and to approve a set of sweeping rules changes to reduce football's violence. In committee meetings, Reid outmaneuvered Camp while receiving critical behind-the-scenes support from Roosevelt.

As a result, football experienced an extreme makeover: The yardage necessary for a first down increased from five to ten. Rules-makers also created a neutral zone at the line of scrimmage, limited the number of players who could line up in the backfield, made the personal foul a heavily penalized infraction, and banned the tossing of ballcarriers.

These were important revisions, and each was approved with an eye toward improving the safety of players. Yet the change that would transform the sport the most was the introduction of the forward pass. Up to this point, football was a game of running and kicking, not throwing. There were quarterbacks but not wide receivers. It took a few years to get the rule right—footballs needed to evolve away from their watermelon-like shape and become more aerodynamic, and coaches and players had to figure out how to take advantage of this new offensive tool. But on November 1, 1913, football moved irreversibly into the modern era.

Army was one of the best teams in the country, a national championship contender. It was scheduled to play a game against a little-known Catholic school from the Midwest. The headline in the New York Times that morning read: "Army Wants Big Score." The little-known Catholic school was Notre Dame. Knute Rockne and his teammates launched football's first true air war, throwing again and again for receptions and touchdowns. And they won, 35-14. Gushed the New York Times:

The Westerners flashed the most sensational football that has been seen in the East this year. The Army players were hopelessly confused and chagrined before Notre Dame's great playing, and their style of old-fashioned close line-smashing play was no match for the spectacular and highly perfected attack of the Indiana collegians.

A West Point cadet named Dwight Eisenhower watched from the sidelines. He was on Army's team but didn't play due to injury. "Everything has gone wrong," he wrote to his girlfriend. "The football team ... got beaten most gloriously by Notre Dame."

With that game, football's long first chapter came to a close. It had reduced the problem of violence, and the game that we enjoy today was born.

Teddy Roosevelt was not one to sit idly by and watch as football died a slow death. Instead, he grabbed the bull by the horns and set up a meeting with Camp and the coaches of Harvard and Princeton to see what can be done to change football. They had come up with some rules which molded the game into what it is today. And it led to the first true air war in college football between Notre Dame and Army, in which Rockne and Company threw again and again for receptions and touchdowns. November 1, 1913, launched football into the modern era and never looked back.

We are seeing the same battle today and Obama is wading into it. Not only do the progressives of today want to sissify the game by enacting strict rules on helmet to helmet hits, spears, and hits below the waist but also there are some progressives who want to ban certain nicknames like Redskins, Indians, Seminoles, and other names. They are trying to drop the traditions of the game, and it is up to many of us today to uphold them. Otherwise, it will just be another aspect of American culture and character down the drain thanks to Obama's "fundamental transformation."

Football and the American Character (Part 6)

Last week, we talked about the rules that came out of the meeting Roosevelt held in 1905 which brought football into the modern era. And Miller ends his speech with what we can learn from Roosevelt.

The example of Roosevelt shows that a skillful leader can use a light touch to solve a vexing problem. As a general rule, of course, we don't want politicians interfering with our sports. The only thing that could make the BCS system worse is congressional involvement.

At the same time, our political leaders help to shape our culture and our expectations. They can promise a world without risk, or they can send a different message. As a father myself, I can sympathize with President Obama's cautious statements about football. At the same time, his comments would have benefitted from some context: Gregg Easterbrook, who writes a football column for ESPN, has pointed out that a teen who drives a car for an hour has about a one in a million chance of dying—compared to a one in six million chance for a teen who spends an hour practicing football.

Americans are a self-governing people. We can make our own judgments about whether to drive or play football—and when we make these choices, we can make them in recognition of the fact that although sports can be dangerous, they're also good for us. They not only make us distinctively American, they make us better Americans.

The BCS system is by far the WORST thing that has happened in college football, and luckily this year will be the last year for it. However, the fact that Congress had to stick its nose in it made it even worse. They have other more pressing things to worry about than sports. In fact, I feel that the presidents and commissioners of the sports leagues can police their own without any congressional interference. After all, like Miller said, Americans are a self-governing people and can make their own judgments, acknowledging the fact that sports can be dangerous but good for us.

If you want to read the entire speech, you can go to http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/file/archives/pdf/2013_09_Imprimis.pdf and if you want to subscribe to Imprimis you can go to <http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/subscriber/new>. If you want to read past issues of Imprimis, go to <http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/archives> where you can read articles from the best conservative minds like Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, Steve Forbes, Brit Hume, Sarah Palin, Thomas Sowell, George Will, Justice Clarence Thomas, Walter E. Williams, Michael Medved, Michelle Malkin, George Gilder, Charles Krauthammer, and others

CHAPTER 6

PART SIX: FUTURE EDITORIALS

This part will deal with future editorials that I have in mind. One such editorial I have in mind is a series of editorials from Imprimis on Executive Powers in Wartime, which I find fitting especially with the divide in the country where many on the right are saying that President Obama is currently shredding the Constitution while those on the left say that Former President George W. Bush had shredded the Constitution since September 11, 2001.

Another editorial I have in mind deals with the Natural Born Citizen debate that I had alluded to in the series on American Exceptionalism. Many say that in order for someone to be a Natural Born Citizen that person would have to be born to two citizen parents. I will go through and thoroughly debunk that false premise with the facts, and even dedicate a couple of hours on Red, Right, and Blue to that very topic in the future.

Also in the American Exceptionalism series I had mentioned the topic of Separation of Church and State. The left would want ALL forms of religion out of the public sphere as they feel that is what Jefferson had meant, but that is another false premise which I reject and will debunk with facts, I will also dedicate a couple of hours on Red, Right, and Blue to that topic in the future as well.

Executive Power in Wartime

Many on the left say that President Bush had shredded the Constitution. Many on the right say President Obama is shredding the Constitution right now. Just what are the executive powers in wartime? Former Attorney General Michael Mukasey gets to the bottom of it in a speech that he gave in Washington, D.C., on September 15, 2011, at the Second Annual Constitution Day Celebration sponsored by Hillsdale College's Allan P. Kirby, Jr. Center for Constitutional Studies and Citizenship.

President Obama campaigned for office largely on the claim that his predecessor had shredded the Constitution. By the Constitution, he could not have meant the document signed on September 17, 1787. Article II of that document begins with a simple declaration: "The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America." Not "some" or "most" or even "all but a teeny-weeny bit" of the executive power. The President is vested with all of it. This is particularly noteworthy when compared with the enumerated legislative powers vested in Congress: "All legislative Powers herein granted." The Founders understood, based in part on their unfortunate experience under the Articles of Confederation, that the branch of government most likely to be in need of the ability to act quickly and decisively is the executive. The branch most likely to overreach is the legislature.

Perhaps, then, candidate Obama was thinking of the Bill of Rights in claiming that President Bush shredded the Constitution. But leaving that question aside for now, let us consider how President Obama has fared in undoing the Bush policies he opposed. He began dramatically in January 2009 by issuing a series of executive orders. According to one, Guantanamo was to be closed within a year. Even though the principal planner of September 11, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, or KSM, had announced that he would plead guilty before a military tribunal at Guantanamo, the Justice Department announced in November 2009 that the military commission was cancelled. Instead, KSM would be brought to the mainland United States to stand trial. In response, Congress passed a statute, relying on its constitutionally-enumerated power of the purse, directing that no federal funds be used to bring any detainee from Guantanamo to the U.S. As a result, the Guantanamo military commission trial for KSM and other detainees charged in connection with September 11 is back on. Another executive order in January 2009 suspended the CIA interrogation program. Instead of these allegedly disgraceful and unconstitutional interrogation techniques, it was announced that anyone acting on behalf of the U.S. government, even a highly trained CIA operative seeking sensitive security-related information, is limited by the Army Field Manual. This manual—because it was drafted for general use—is pitched to the capabilities of the most junior recruit in the field interrogating someone he has just captured. In fact, it has been available on the Internet for years and has been used by terrorists as a training manual for resisting interrogation.

The abandoned CIA program involved—in what is probably the most disastrous marketing term since New Coke—"enhanced interrogation" techniques which were, in fact, completely lawful. When detainees were subjected to those techniques—detainees who self-selected as both knowledgeable of Al Qaeda and resistant to lesser techniques—we learned a great deal. Three of these detainees—Abu Zubaydah, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, and Abdel Rahim al Nashiri—gave up a huge trove of valuable information. Not only did KSM disclose general information on how Al Qaeda moved money and people, but also specific information that helped disrupt other plots. One such plot involved airplanes attacking the Library Tower in Los Angeles. It was to be carried out by a South Asian group headed by a man named Hambali. Other information resulted in the capture of people involved in a plan to develop a biological weapons capability in the U.S. The list goes on.

When Obama ran for President, he had said that within a year of his inauguration he would close Guantanamo because the War on Terror should be fought not from a military standpoint but from a legal standpoint. Hence, why he pushed for Khalid Sheikh Muhammad and others who had plotted the attacks of September 11, 2001, to be tried in the shadows of Ground Zero. As much as many Americans do not like George W. Bush, keep in mind that

he had the correct mindset when focusing on the War on Terror. It should be fought from a military standpoint. Granted, there is this Geneva Convention that many say SHOULD be the rules of war but keep in mind that at the time it came about, there were no computers or high technological bombs or rocket launchers that we see today. With the advent of those weapons, the enemy can attack us from long range. They can even attack us from short range by falsifying identification cards and slip in through our defenses, like the 19 hijackers on 9/11 did and also how Osama Bin Laden and Khalid Sheikh Muhammad supplied those cards and passports to those who seek to do harm over the world.

If anything, Obama has served to weaken this country, not build it up. Hopefully in this small series I will go into just how he is doing that and just what is the TRUE Executive power in wartime.

Executive Power in Wartime (Part 2)

Mukasey continues his speech with a couple of very surprising remarks on what Obama is doing to the terrorists, treating them not as enemy combatants but rather as routine criminal suspects. In a way this highlights the differences between how the left perceives the war on Islamic terrorism and how the right perceives it

Not only has this interrogation program been abandoned, but when people today are apprehended in connection with terrorist plots directed at this country—and there have been more than 20 since September 11—most are turned over immediately to law enforcement authorities, informed of their Miranda rights, and treated as routine criminal suspects. What do we lose in this process? With the would-be Christmas Day bomber Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab, we lost the chance at information about who had built his bomb. From bombs that have shown up in packages originating in Yemen, it appears that the same bomb maker is still in business, and he is believed to be responsible for a bomb that injured Prince Mohammed Bin Nayef, the man largely responsible for Saudi Arabia's counter-terrorism efforts.

Although Guantanamo remains open, the President remains committed to closing it. For example, no new detainees are being brought to Guantanamo. We learned a month or two ago that a man named Warsame was apprehended and was thought to be in possession of valuable intelligence. He was placed aboard a naval vessel and debriefed for two months, after which he was advised of his Miranda rights and brought to the U.S.

The administration disdains military tribunals, notwithstanding the fact that they have been used in our history from the Revolutionary War to World War II and are provided for specifically in a statute passed by Congress called the Military Commissions Act. The administration also remains committed to figuring out a way to release those detained in Guantanamo, despite the fact that at least 20 percent of Guantanamo alumni have returned to the battlefield. We know that figure because 20 percent have been recaptured or killed. How many others are still in the fight is anyone's guess.

While Osama bin Laden and Anwar al-Awlaki have been killed under the Obama presidency, they would not have been if it were not for the intelligence that began under the Bush presidency. If Obama had his way, they would not have been killed but rather arrested, read their Miranda rights, and brought to the U.S. for trial, the same way that Bill Clinton had handled terrorism especially after the 1993 World Trade Center bombing in which a truck was detonated in the basement (another Khalid Sheikh Muhammad financed attack which was co-signed by the "Blind Sheikh" Omar Abdel-Rahman and accomplished by Ramzi Yousef, KSM's nephew) which led to 7 killed and 1,042 injured. What Bush did was realize that the enemies in this current war do not wear uniforms or ally themselves with a particular nation, but rather a philosophy and a mission. As such, he had taken the fight to Al Qaeda and fought them on their battlefield, using guerilla style tactics. Obama wants to either appease the Muslims or try them for crimes as criminals, and not fight them as enemy combatants. In my mind, that is wrong and one reason why Bush had it correctly.

Executive Power in Wartime (Part 3)

Mukasey goes into the history of what Osama bin Laden stood for and also the history of the Muslim Brotherhood, which is what is ruling a majority of the Muslim countries and is taking over other countries as we speak.

So after all this, where do we stand? The intelligence gathering techniques adopted and followed during the preceding administration not only remain on the books but are actively pursued. And thanks to a vigorous and courageous exercise of the Article II Commander in-Chief power, and the splendid performance of a team of Navy Seals, Osama bin Laden is dead. I certainly would not minimize that achievement. He needed killing, and he and we needed it to be done at the hands of Americans. It was done in a way that allowed us to exploit the trove of intelligence that was found in his home—though one wishes that less had been said about it at the time, rendering it more effective. And his death has great symbolic significance, because of the status he had attained during the ten years since September 11. But it is impossible to gauge the significance of bin Laden's death unless and until we recognize the simple fact that our encounter with what he stood for began much earlier than September 11, 2001.

What bin Laden stood for was Islamism, which—insofar as it holds the U.S. in a weird combination of awe and contempt—has been incubating for about as long as we have known about the other two “isms” that we successfully conquered in the last century. As a movement distinct from the religion of Islam itself, Islamism traces back to Egypt in the 1920s, when the loosely organized Muslim Brotherhood was established by a man named Hassan al-Banna. Al-Banna founded the Muslim Brotherhood as a reaction to the modernizing influence of Kemal Ataturk, who dismantled the shell of what was left of the Muslim caliphate in Turkey, banned the fez and headscarves, and dragged his country into the 20th century.

Al-Banna's principal disciple was also an educator—a bureaucrat in the education department of the Egyptian government named Sayyid Qutb. Qutb caused enough trouble in Egypt to get himself awarded a traveling fellowship in 1948, the year al-Banna was killed. Regrettably for us, Qutb chose to travel to Greeley, Colorado. And although it would be hard to imagine a more inoffensive place than post-World War II Greeley, Colorado, for a man like Qutb it was Sodom and Gomorrah. He hated everything he saw: American haircuts, enthusiasm for sports, jazz, and what he called the “animal-like mixing of the sexes,” even in church. His conclusion was that Americans were “numb to faith in art, faith in religion, and faith in spiritual values altogether,” and that Muslims must regard “the white man, whether European or American ... [as] our first enemy.”

Note what Mukasey said that Qutb had concluded about Americans:

His conclusion was that Americans were “numb to faith in art, faith in religion, and faith in spiritual values altogether,” and that Muslims must regard “the white man, whether European or American ... [as] our first enemy.”

I ask you. Is this the type of people that we need to be friends with and coexist with? This regard of Europeans and Americans as Islam's first enemy is what bin Laden had proposed. And one other thing, even the Islamic holy book, the Koran, says that all infidels should be put to death if not converted. Therefore, they are the new face of the enemy, and according to David Barton of Wallbuilders, had been our enemy since the early days of America where the Barbary Pirates along the African coast took American sailors. The Marine hymn which starts out with the words “from the Halls of Montezuma **TO THE SHORES OF TRIPOLI**” basically showed that early Americans fought on the shores of Tripoli, in modern-day Libya, against the Muslims. So unlike what some people say, America has had a battle with Islam ever since the 18th century. It is just that the battle had been escalated since about 1979 with the taking of the American Embassy in Iran through the World Trade Center bombings of 1993 and 2001. TRUE Americans, REAL Americans are sick of it and we are not taking it any more.



Executive Power in Wartime (Part 4)

Mukasey continues peeling the layers open and tells us about the history of the Muslim Brotherhood and also bin Laden, going so far as to reveal that one of the 1993 World Trade Center bombers was present at the assassination of an Israeli politician in New York.

Qutb later returned to Egypt, quit the civil service, and joined the Muslim Brotherhood. He welcomed Gamal Abdel Nasser's coup against the corrupt monarchy of King Farouk in 1952, but then became disillusioned with Nasser for failing to institute Sharia law. He opposed Nasser, and was subsequently arrested and tortured. However, he continued to write and agitate for Islam and against Western civilization, particularly against Jews, whom he blamed for atheistic materialism and considered the worst enemies of Muslims. He was released for a time, but eventually was re-arrested, convicted of conspiracy against the government, and hanged in 1966.

Many members of the Brotherhood fled to Saudi Arabia, where they found refuge and ideological sustenance. Qutb's brother was among those who fled and taught the doctrine in Saudi Arabia. Among his students were Ayman al-Zawahiri, an Egyptian who would become a leading Al Qaeda ideologist, and a then-obscure Osama bin Laden, the pampered child of one of the richest construction families in the country. And the rest, as they say, is history.

That history did not come to these shores on September 11—or even on February 26, 1993, when a truck bomb detonated in the basement of the World Trade Center, killing six and wounding hundreds. It came at the latest in the 1980s, when a couple of FBI agents spotted a group of men taking what looked like particularly aggressive target practice in Calverton, Long Island. When they approached, they were accused of what we now call racial profiling, and they backed off. In November 1990, one of those men, El-Sayyid Nosair, assassinated a rightwing Israeli politician, Meir Kahane, in the ballroom of a Manhattan hotel. When the 1993 World Trade Center bombers demanded the freeing of Nosair from jail, it became apparent that the Kahane assassination had not been the lone act of a lone gunman. Authorities reviewed the amateur video of Kahane's speech the night he was killed and discovered that one of those 1993 bombers had been in the hall when Kahane was shot. Further investigation disclosed that another was driving the intended getaway vehicle.

Not many people know about this, but it needs to be said. For lack of a better word, Muslim terrorists have little to no regard for who they kill. They just kill any who they perceive as a threat to their culture and philosophy, whether it is a normal citizen (as we had seen on United Flight 93 on September 11, 2001) an Israeli politician (as we had seen with Israeli politician Meir Kahane in November, 1990) or even an Israeli soldier (as we had seen with Daniel Lewin on American Flight 11 on September 11, 2001). The bottom line is that the Muslims seek to eliminate all those who stand in their way for world domination, and we need to do all we can to maintain our freedom and keep America as it is, not giving in to Sharia Muslim Law.

Executive Power in Wartime (Part 5)

Mukasey continues his speech by talking about bin Laden declaring war on the United States in 1996 and then the bombings of the embassies in Africa in 1998 and the bombing of the USS Cole in 2000, prior to September 11.

The man who served as the spiritual advisor to Nosair and the 1993 World Trade Center bombers, Omar Abdel Rahman, the so-called blind sheikh, along with Nosair and several others, were tried before me and convicted for participating in a conspiracy to conduct a war of urban terror against this country—a war that included the Kahane murder, the first World Trade Center bombing, and a plot to blow up other landmarks around New York and assassinate Egyptian leader Hosni Mubarak when he visited the United Nations. The list of unindicted co-conspirators in that case included Osama bin Laden.

At the time, all of this was treated as a series of crimes—unconventional crimes, to be sure, but crimes nevertheless. This despite the fact that in 1996, and again in 1998, Osama bin Laden declared that he and his cohorts were at war with the United States.

In 1998, the American embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, were bombed almost simultaneously. Again the criminal law was invoked, this time in an indictment that named Osama bin Laden as a defendant. Apparently he was unimpressed, or at least undeterred, because in 2000, Al Qaeda bombed the USS Cole in Aden, Yemen, killing 17 sailors. It would have carried out the bombing of another naval vessel, but for the fact that the barge carrying the explosives was overloaded and sank.

Then came September 11, and to the call “bring them to justice” was added the call “bring justice to them.” We were told that we were at war more than 50 years after Sayyid Qutb determined that Islamists would have to make war on us, about 15 years after Islamists had made it clear that they were training for war with us, and five years after Osama bin Laden made it official with a declaration of war.

In fighting Islamism, we are handicapped at the strategic level by the refusal of those in authority to acknowledge the goals of our adversaries. Those goals are essentially political, and involve the recreation of an Islamic caliphate and the imposition of Sharia law over as broad a swath of the world as possible. This is a profoundly anti-democratic movement at its core, and it regards the whole idea of man-made law as anathema. Instead, we try to be inoffensive by using a term that originated in the administration in which I served, and we refer to a war on terror or terrorism. People who wish to quibble about what it is we are at war with take the discussion off into absurdity. One such person is the President’s Assistant for National Security, John Brennan, who, before an audience at the Center for Strategic Studies, ridiculed the idea of a war on terrorism or on terror, saying it is impossible to have a war on a means or a state of mind.

Prior to 9/11/2001, terrorists were treated as criminals and not as militants. Hence, Clinton had wanted the terrorists indicted for crimes and not strung up or executed. That gave bin Laden the idea that America is weak and that it gives him free reign to attack at will. If Clinton had treated terrorism as a military threat and not a criminal one, then I think 9/11 would not have occurred.

We see Obama wanting to take terrorist attacks back to pre-9/11 mindset. We see that in John Brennan, Obama’s Assistant for National Security, saying before an audience at the Center for Strategic Studies that it is nearly impossible to have a war on a means or a state of mind. bin Laden and company might have a state of mind, but they physically put it out there. We need to hit them where they live and not listen to the leftists who want to appease the terrorists.

Executive Power in Wartime (Part 6)

We know that there was a problem of communication as to what happened which led up to the 9/11 attacks on the American side. Mukasey tells us just what needs to happen to make sure it does not happen again.

This lack of clarity also distorts the view of policy makers about what is happening in the Middle East, and so they daydream about democratic movements when the reality on the ground is more populist than democratic. The principal beneficiary of populism is more likely to be the Muslim Brotherhood than the local spokesman for Facebook. The credo of the Muslim Brotherhood is succinct and chilling: Allah is our goal, the Prophet Muhammad is our leader, the Qu'ran is our constitution, jihad is our way, and death in the way of Allah is our promised end.

If the death of Osama bin Laden is more than simply a spasm, or an opportunity to engage in self-congratulation—if it helps provide some insight into the nature of what it is we are fighting—then it will have been significant indeed. If not, its significance will be substantially diminished.

The signs do not seem promising. Even on September 11 itself, as was pointed out by Fouad Ajami, there was no discussion whatever of the 19 people who perpetrated the atrocity. Ajami pointed in particular to Ziad Jarrah, the most Westernized of the hijackers. Raised in Beirut, Lebanon, to be cosmopolitan in the spirit of that city, he then went to Hamburg, Germany, where he was radicalized, and he then wound up at the controls of Flight 93, the flight that was supposed to hit the U.S. Capitol. It didn't because the passengers learned what had already happened at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, figured out what was in store for them and their country, and chose to act.

There is much to be learned from those facts. Start with the last. We learn the importance of intelligence. The passengers on Flight 93 were able to act because of what they had learned about what was going on elsewhere. Intelligence gathering must be our number one priority. The people waging war on us are part of a movement that does not occupy any particular place or country that we can demolish and then pronounce ourselves the winners. They live in some cases among us, and the only way of opposing them successfully is to find out in advance what they intend to do and to thwart it.

Second, note that Jarrah was radicalized not in the Middle East, but in the West. We must be aware of those in our society who wish to create closed ethnic zones, where Muslims essentially run their own affairs and outsiders enter only at their peril. This has already happened in the suburbs of French cities, in parts of England, and in other places you would not expect it such as Malmo, Sweden, and it allows radicalization to go on undetected. Guidelines have been put in place to allow the FBI to function for the first time in its history as an intelligence gathering organization and not simply as a law enforcement agency. If the Bureau partners with state and local law enforcement, then the kind of insular activity that allowed Jarrah to be radicalized can be broken up. Those guidelines must remain in place, and must be defended.

Now, if you noticed Mukasey brought out two key things which we must need to take note. First is the fact that the reason Flight 93 failed to hit the Capitol or the White House is because the passengers learned about the attacks on the World Trade Center and proceeded to fight back. Good intelligence, like what George W. Bush had proposed and then proceeded to do after 9/11, can bring the fight to the enemy instead of them bringing the fight to us. If they are among us, then we need to find out what they intend to do and find some way to counter it and thwart it.

The second thing Mukasey said was that we must be aware of those in our culture and society who wish to create closed ethnic zones, where those of that culture essentially run their own affairs and outsiders enter at their own peril. We can see that because Ziad Jarrah, pilot of Flight 93, was radicalized not in the Middle East but in the West,

in the Hamburg cell in Germany. The FBI and CIA need to partner with state and local law enforcement agencies to break up the closed ethnic zones, lest another 9/11 happens on our shores once more.



Executive Power in Wartime (Part 7)

Mukasey finished his speech by highlighting the Constitution and the amendments which protect and guarantee our rights as Americans and which will help keep the system known as America intact.

Doing that will require an intelligent understanding of the part of the Constitution I didn't discuss at the outset, the part that animated so much criticism of the Bush administration by those now in charge—the Bill of Rights. This part of the Constitution provides robust protection to both public and private activity that we value, which is essential for the continuation of our civic life. But it does not require that we close our eyes when there are people plainly setting the stage for activity that is in no way protected.

The First Amendment protects free speech and freedom of worship. It permits preaching even violence in the name of religion. But it does not guarantee that such speech will go undetected. Nor does it guarantee that evidence of it cannot be presented in a court when and if it is appropriate to charge that the speaker and those to whom he spoke understood this protected speech and took it as a call to unprotected action. This includes action that itself consists only of speech—such as an agreement to commit a crime, which is itself the crime of conspiracy.

The Fourth Amendment protects against unreasonable searches and seizures, and contains a separate warrant clause providing that warrants may issue only on a finding of probable cause. That does not mean that a search conducted for intelligence purposes requires a warrant, only that it be reasonable.

The Fifth and Sixth Amendments guarantee due process, counsel to those accused of crimes, and the right to confront witnesses, but their application is limited to trials occurring in Article III courts. How much process is due and what kind of evidence may be received and under what circumstances in other tribunals, such as military commissions, is an entirely different story.

The message lurking in the structure of the Constitution is that those acting lawfully under it deserve at least the benefit of the doubt when they act to protect the common good. That is not meant to be a statement or a suggestion of a jurisprudential standard, a standard of law; but it is meant as a prudential standard, a standard of civics and public discourse. This standard will help keep intact the system that we depend on to preserve the nation that Abraham Lincoln called the last, best hope of earth—words that are truer today than they were when he spoke them during another time of trouble.

Abraham Lincoln called America the last, best hope of earth. In reading it I am reminded of what AJ Reissig had written at the end of *Escape to Freedom*.

“I guess the great experiment failed,” Kirk said.

“What do you mean,” Sebastian asked.

“Thomas Jefferson called the United States Constitution the ‘Great Experiment,’” Kirk said. I guess he was wrong; it didn't last.”

The Constitution was called by Jefferson to be the “Great Experiment,” and if Obama and the socialist liberals have their way, it will fail. They consider it to be a living document, changed at the whim and power of them and the people. Now while it cannot be changed totally, it can be amended, provided people believe in the strict construction and intent of the Constitution. America is the last, best hope of earth in as far as freedom and liberty are concerned. Any else would serve to destroy the vestiges which make us the greatest country on earth.

If you want to read the entire speech, go to http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/file/archives/pdf/2011_10_Imprimis.pdf as Mukasey is a wise man. And if you want to read more articles of Imprimis, go to <http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/archives> and if you want to subscribe to Imprimis, visit <http://imprimis.hillsdale.edu/> for more information.



CHAPTER 7

AFTERMATH

Red, Right, and Blue gives the news of the week from the right (Conservative) side of the political spectrum, but one thing I always like to do is engage the conversation with those on the other side. While we might not have the same political preferences, that does not in any way mean that we cannot sit down and come to some sort of consensus. It is my hope that after you have read my editorials and rants that we come to some sort of agreement about this nation that we both love and that we use those things we agree on to make this the best country on the face of the earth.